DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 119 HE 005 027

TITLE	Planning a Consortium of Colleges and Universities for Equal Opportunity in College Construction.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. Human Resources Center.
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	101p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Consortia; Educational Planning; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Minority Groups; Racial Discrimination; School Community Relationship; *School Construction

ABSTRACT

The project to plan a college and university consortium for equal employment opportunity was designed toward 4 goals: (1) To bring about a change in the employment patterns for the Philadelphia metropolitan area in the construction trades by increasing job and training opportunities for nonwhites; (2) To increase opportunities for minority contractors; (3) To demonstrate a university model as a force for planned social change; (4) To demonstrate a model of interuniversity cooperation in planning. The following conclusions can be drawn as a result of the project experience and research: (1) An institution can have an effect on the composition of work force on its construction projects; (2) It will be necessary for an institution to make deliberate decisions and take specific action to provide equal employment opportunity on its construction projects; (3) Law and public pressure both within and without the institution are effective spurs to social change; (4) The project experience suggests that, while it is difficult to develop a cooperative structure among institutions with many different levels of response to the primary purpose, the attempt to create such a structure encourages action toward change among the individual participants. Appendices include descriptive information about participating institutions and summaries of recommendations from workshops. (Author/PG)

ED 086119

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA
HUMAN RESOURCES CENTER
Graduate School of Fine Arts
Department of City and Regional Planning
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19174

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 086119

PLANNING A CONSORTIUM OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION

Human Resources Center
University of Pennsylvania
Howard E. Mitchell, Ph.D.
Director

Project Personnel

Edward E. Cahill, Ph.D.
Sammis B. White, Ph.D.
Zelda Wolfaman
Marion Fox, A.B., M.C.P.
Patricia Rosenbaum, A.B.

August, 1973

"We bring to the task of community uplift Boy-Scout eagerness, secular zeal, and liberal compassion. As True Believers in the Baconian notion of Knowledge as Social Power we are not afraid to dream the impossible dream of social salvation in race relations, political salvation in community relations, and economic salvation in development. We bring as well the intolerable weight of a guilty conscience, for have we not rejected blacks in the name of high standards, trained Peace Corps workers in the arts of community development for Brazil but not Harlem, and done research in Calcutta and Pakistan to the neglect of Watts and Hough."

President Harold Enarson
Cleveland State University
1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. The Human Resources Center Experience. 6

III. The Consortium Project - Design and Methods. . . . 9

IV. Findings 16

A. Planning for Change within the Institution . . 17

B. Planning for a Cooperative Structure 32

C. Final Status 36

V. Conclusions. 38

Bibliography

Appendix I. Descriptive Information About Participating Institutions. 1- 4

Appendix II. Report of the Conference on Planning a Consortium for Equal Opportunity . . . 1-13

A. Text of Address by President Martin Meyerson University of Pennsylvania

B. Text of Address by Mr. John Wilks Office of Federal Contract Compliance U.S. Department of Labor

C. Summary of Recommendations from Workshops and Task Force Committees

Appendix III. Working Statement of Commitment to the Consortium. 1-10

I. Introduction

The 1960's witnessed a period of unrest both on the university campus and in the larger community. The university like other institutions of society was openly challenged concerning its social responsibility and responsiveness to the unmet problems of an urbanized society. On some campuses students began to demand that an institution of higher learning mirror the ideals and values of the society within its own community. A particular target was the degree to which minority members were being employed in campus construction. For example, in 1963 one student leadership group at the University of Pennsylvania presented President Gaylord P. Harnwell with a nine - point action program concerning the hiring practices and apprenticeship policies of the building and construction trades engaged in raising new structures on the campus. In the discussions that followed President Harnwell made it em'nently clear that the University was committed to the democractic ideal and considered the anti-discrimination clause to be a vital part of every University building contract.

"These discussions also made clear the opportunity for students, faculty and administration to have a meaningful impact upon the life of people in the community, as well as an opportunity for students, faculty, and administration to widen their horizons and experience. The Human Resources Center was established as the administrative mechanism through which the resources of the University on all levels might be coordinated, in the areas of

education and human and industrial relations, relating to social change and equal opportunity."[1]

Therefore, from its very beginning the Human Resources Center (HRC) was involved in aspects of this university-community problem. The HRC later became aware of the magnitude of the unemployment problem for non-whites with special reference to discrepancies in white - non white employment in the skilled construction trades.

---

1. Mitchell, Howard E., "The Human Resources Center of the University of Pennsylvania," University and the Urban Crisis, in press, 1973.

To increase employment opportunity for all citizens was still an urban priority in the Philadelphia Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) in 1971. The total number of unemployed persons in the SMSA stood at 61,700, and of this number, 22,000 or over 35 percent, were non-white persons.[2] In this, Philadelphia is consistent with the Commonwealth and the nation; both show higher rates of unemployment for minorities than for white workers. (Table 1)

The skilled construction trades offer attractive opportunities for urban employment at relatively high wage rates. Estimates in 1971 were that manpower requirements in construction would increase during the decade 1970-1980 by as much as a million men.[3] Table 2 illustrates the projected growth by trade for the Philadelphia area by 1975; percentages of growth from 1960 range from 14% to almost 60%.

Despite the opportunities, and despite the efforts of civil rights organizations and government agencies, minority employment in the construction trades in the Philadelphis SMSA in 1967 stood at only 2.6 percent for the mechanical trades, offering more skilled jobs at higher wages, in contrast to 65.6 percent for laborers. Tables 3 and 4 show the participation of Negroes and

---

2. Report, Philadelphia Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System for Fiscal Year 1971, Part A.

3. Hahn, William F., "Construction Manpower Needs by 1980," Monthly Labor Review, Vol. 94, #7, July, 1971, pp. 12-18.

Table 1[4]

Percent Unemployment in 1970 - United States and Pennsylvania

RACE	AREA	
	UNITED STATES	PENNSYLVANIA
WHITE	4.5	3.2
NON-WHITE	8.2	6.2

4. Poverty in Pennsylvania, 2nd edition, Community Services of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1972, p. 13.

Table 2[5]

Demand for Construction Workers in Philadelphia SMSA: 1960 - 1975

CRAFT	EMPLOYMENT		PROJECTED EMPLOYMENT	PROJECTED EMP. GROWTH (PERCENT)
	1960	1970	1975	1960 - 1975
Carpenters	14,733	16,980	16,800	14.0
Brickmasons Stone and Tilesetters	4,963	5,740	6,000	28.0
Electricians	9,903	12,150	12,900	30.3
Painters	9,531	10,520	10,850	13.8
Plasterers	1,530	1,960	2,100	37.3
Plumbers and Pipefitters	10,952	14,140	15,200	38.8
Roofers and Slaters	1,665	2,400	2,650	59.2
Structural Metal Workers	2,972	4,070	4,500	51.4
Tinsmiths Coppersmiths and Sheet-metal Workers	4,987	6,140	6,530	23.1

5. Report, Philadelphia SMSA C.A.M.P.S., Part A, p. 72.

Table 3[6]

Negro Participation in Construction Unions

in Philadelphia, 1967

BUILDING TRADE UNIONS	PERCENT NEGRO MEMBERSHIP
Plumbers	0.4
Electricians	0.8
Carpenters	1.9
Mechanical Trades	2.6
Painters	13.1
Laborers	65.6

Table 4[7]

Spanish-Americans Participation in Construction Unions

in Philadelphia, 1967

BUILDING TRADE UNIONS	PERCENT SPANISH-AMERICAN MEMBERSHIP
Mechanical Trades	1.12
Laborers	5.5
All Trades	2.9

6. Data from U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1967.
7. Ibid.

Spanish-Americans in construction unions in the Philadelphia area. Figures are based on union membership, since the principal entry into contract construction is through construction unions.

Efforts such as the Philadelphia Plan, the plan for minority participation in Federally-funded construction established under Federal Executive Order 11246 for application in the Philadelphia area, had not had sufficient impact to augment the low number of nonwhites in the skilled trades. Prominent spokesmen for civil rights organizations were quoted to this effect in the public press.[8]

It was against this background that the Human Resources Center designed its Project to Plan for a Consortium of Colleges and Universities for Equal Opportunity in College Construction. In keeping with the thinking of the Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education entitled The Campus and The City,[9] the Center hoped to test the extent to which colleges and universities of a given region were ready, not merely to respond to a vital community problem directly affecting campus life, but to plan actively to meet this manpower situation. Moreover, the Center sought to test

---

8. Wall Street Journal, December 3, 1970, New York Times, November 17, 1971, Philadelphia Bulletin, October 11, 1972.

9. The Campus and The City: Maximizing Assets and Reducing Liabilities, McGraw-Hill, New Jersey, December, 1972.

the extent to which these institutions were ready not only to plan but to plan in concert.

II. The Human Resources Center Experience

In 1968 and 1969, one of the Center's activities was the Minority Employment Project, a project to research and plan a model of university-community interaction on employment opportunities in the construction trades. One aspect of the project concerned providing information to the community of West Philadelphia, in which the University is located, about opportunities in the construction trades. This was done through a conference which offered community groups a chance to learn about referral channels, training programs and other resources available to minority people seeking employment in the construction trades. A second aspect of the project dealt with research and development of a plan for the University to offer employment opportunities to minority workers through its own construction activities. This plan was embodied in the Report on University Employment Policy in the Construction Trades ("The Harnwell Report"), a plan which was implemented by the University and stirred wide-spread interest among other institutions and agencies.

The final Report of the Minority Employment Project noted several general conclusions about agencies who participate in the construction trades and their relationship to the question of

providing equal employment opportunity.[10] The findings related to the groups cited below are:

· Contractors, both primary and subcontractors, were seen to be short of skilled workers, which contributed to the rising cost of construction. They were also seen as responding to rigid work roles and wage demands as established by the unions and to an uncertain economic outlook, both of which made them reluctant to press the building trades unions to act to expand work opportunities.

· Building trades unions were seen as greatly concerned with job security and preserving the present system of employment, as well as maintaining the level of skill within the union. They were more strongly entrenched in commercial-industrial and housing construction. Unionized projects were more long-term, yielded higher wages and employment stability than non-union projects.

· Minority contractors were seen as relatively handicapped by lack of capital, some lack of managerial and business expertise, and difficulty in obtaining loans and posting bonds.

· Government equal employment opportunity policy, as embodied in the Philadelphia Plan, was seen as too recent in its application to allow for evaluation. The possibility that unions

---

10. Final Report, Coordination of Community Programs to Train Minority Youth for the Building Trades, 1969, HRC Files.

and contractors might initiate their own efforts to open employment to nonwhites existed, since neither unions nor contractors supported the Plan.

• The university's role in construction was seen as a dual one. As a presumed neutral, its resources could be applied to coordination and planning for change. As an employer and builder, its contracts could be used as leverage in opening opportunities for nonwhites. The use of this leverage in the past had been limited by a commitment to union labor and a priority concern with completion of construction, but the University of Pennsylvania's response to the recommendations of the Report on University Employment Policy in the Construction Trades was encouraging.

The results of the Minority Employment Project indicated a need for further research, coordination and model-building in the field of institutional activities in opening employment opportunities. The Human Resources Center determined to explore the possibility of planning and developing a consortium of colleges and universities, with other interested non-profit institutions, to work together in using their construction projects and their combined concern to increase employment opportunities for nonwhite workers. The limited effectiveness of a single institution working alone, and the interest in responding to the student concern for social causes which had been manifested on campuses across the nation in the 1960's made the consortium approach a promising avenue for

study and exploration.

III. The Consortium Project - Design and Methods

The project to plan a college and university consortium for equal employment opportunity was designed to work toward four goals:

1. to bring about a change in the employment patterns for the Philadelphia metropolitan area in the construction trades by increasing job and training opportunities for nonwhites;
2. to increase opportunities for minority contractors;
3. to demonstrate a model of the university as a force for planned social change;
4. to demonstrate a model of inter-university cooperation in planning.

The Human Resources Center's role was to be that of a convener and coordinator, including the planning and coordination of a conference to discuss techniques of change, and an information broker. Throughout the project, HRC's relations with its parent university, the University of Pennsylvania, were the same as with all other participants; HRC did not act as a representative of the University of Pennsylvania in project activities.

More than forty colleges and universities in the south-eastern Pennsylvania region were invited to send representatives to the project. The initial invitation to college presidents stressed that planning was the major concern: "We do want to emphasize that the Task Force is in no way a commitment on your part toward joining the Consortium, but is an opportunity for a mutual exploration of

what such a Consortium can accomplish." The invitation went on to note that the organization of the Consortium itself would not take place until after the planning Conference "with the complete approval of the administration of each university."[11]

Forty-one colleges and universities accepted the invitation to participate in this planning process. They represented the educational diversity of the area, and the appointed representatives ranged from the President through vice-presidents, deans, presidential assistants, faculty members and building superintendents. The 41 institutions were about evenly divided between suburban and urban locations: 22 suburban or country locations and 19 urban or urban-residential. They ranged in size from Temple University, one of the nation's largest institutions of higher education with an estimated 1972 enrollment of 33,000 students in all of its programs, to the Philadelphia Divinity School with a 1972 enrollment of 65 students. There were 15 colleges, 4 universities, 9 junior and community colleges, and 13 special, professional or technical institutions. Thirty-one were coeducational, nine were womens' schools and one was a mens' school. They were supported financially through a variety of sources: private, private with state aid, state-funded or state-owned, and a combination of state and local funding for community colleges.

---

11. Invitation to Presidents of Universities and Colleges in Southeastern Pennsylvania, January 11, 1971, HRC Files.

The institutional representatives were drawn mainly from the administrative structure of the institutions. There were 2 presidents, 10 vice-presidents or directors, 3 presidential assistants, 4 deans, 6 bursars or business managers, and 3 drawn from engineering or physical facilities departments. Seven representatives were faculty members and 6 came from community outreach, educational services or development offices. Most of the representatives had been at their respective institutions less than 10 years; 18 had been there for less than 5 years.

According to surveys which were carried out by HRC staff in the early months of the project, 21 institutions reported current or proposed projects for new building, expansion or renovation and remodeling. The total amount for all projects, confirmed or tentative, for the period 1971-1976 was $595,555,972 of which slightly over $300,000,000 was scheduled for 1972-1973.

Two small planning meetings, attended by representatives of 10 colleges selected for variety and experience, preceded the first general Task Force meetings. At these preliminary sessions the goals and possible action techniques of the project were explored and initial plans made. These included the development of an Advisory Council drawn from the larger construction community, carrying out a survey (cited above) to show current and projected building plans of the participating institutions, and the outline of areas of possible consortium activity, such as training programs and methods of monitoring.

Following the planning meetings, two general Task Force meetings were held for all interested institutions, one for Philadelphia area colleges and universities and one for suburban institutions. Representatives of 30 of the 41 institutions who had agreed to participate attended these meetings. At them, the background of the project was explained, information on current and projected building plans was exchanged and current efforts toward expansion of employment opportunities were reported. Possible action areas were further outlined, including relationships with unions, contractors, the Federal government and the Pennsylvania General State Authority, and possibilities for training programs. The Task Force decided to organize in small subcommittees for further study of specific issues working toward development of recommendations for a general conference to be held in the fall of 1971. The subcommittees would include as members representatives of the participating institutions and persons drawn from the larger construction community who would become members of the Advisory Council. Advisory Council members participated in project activities through the fall conference although the Council itself was never convened as a separate body.

The following subcommittees were established: University Curriculum as an Aid to Equal Opportunity; Equal Employment Policies under the Pennsylvania General State Authority; Utilization of Minority Contractors; Methods of University Monitoring of Employment; Minority Hiring and Training Program Development; Extending

Equal Employment Opportunity to Private College Building; Conference and Consortium Policy Formation. Thirty institutions were represented on the subcommittees, which were chaired by members of the Task Force. The groups met at their own convenience through the summer and early fall of 1971.

During this period the Human Resources Center staff established and implemented the Clearinghouse of Information, one of its major responsibilities throughout the project. Through the Clearinghouse, information was distributed to the Task Force members on current and projected building programs of participating institutions, national trends and activities in the specific areas of subcommittee concern, local programs for job training and minority contractor assistance, programs and activities in equal opportunity at other colleges and universities, Federal and state laws and regulations in this field.

On Saturday, November 13, 1971, the Conference for Planning a Consortium on Equal Opportunity was held at the University of Pennsylvania. The goals proposed for the conference were four:

1. to provide a forum for discussion with concerned organizations from the five-county area and with local, state and national officials with expertise in the problems involved with expanding employment opportunity in construction for minority workers;

2. to present to the Task Force members information on the urgent problems of expanding minority employment opportunities in university projects;

3. to carry out policy planning and development of recommendations, and present these policies and

recommendations to the Conference as a further step in developing the Consortium;

4. to explore strategies for implementation of a Consortium and the adoption of recommended programs.

More than 80 persons participated in the conference, including representatives of 20 area colleges and universities, community organizations, the construction industry and government agencies. The program featured a welcoming address by Martin Meyerson, President of the University of Pennsylvania; workshop sessions on areas of subcommittee concern; a luncheon address by John L. Wilkes, Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, U.S. Department of Labor; critique of workshop reports by a panel made up of Robert Albert, Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Intergroup Relations, Tufts University; John Moran, General Manager of Planning, Princeton University; Wesley Toles, Associate Director of the Office of Urban Affairs, Case Western Reserve University; moderated by Jefferson B. Fordham, Esq., former Dean of the Law School, University of Pennsylvania.

Following the conference a general conference report, including all workshop recommendations, was distributed to Task Force members, Advisory Council members and conference attendees. Task Force members were requested by the project coordinator to develop committees of support at their respective institutions, including faculty and student members, to work for further implementation of the Consortium planning. As far as the Human Resources Center staff was able to determine, this step was not taken at most participating

institutions.

In February, 1972, after funding had been approved for the second year of the project, a Task Force meeting was held to discuss the conference report and to consider the next steps to be taken toward formalizing the Consortium. Representatives of 9 institutions attended this meeting, and it was the concensus of the group that the report be further edited, and that the HRC staff make efforts to contact each institution directly before any decisions about next steps were taken.

The Human Resources Center staff, accordingly, further refined the conference recommendations into a proposed statement of commitment expressing the goals of the proposed Consortium and means available to implement those goals. A questionnaire covering information about the representative, the participating institution, its building programs, equal opportunity policies and attitudes toward the Consortium was developed and used in a series of interviews with representatives of 35 of the participating institutions. At this time there were 37 institutions still active in the project; two could not be included because of illness or unavailability of their representatives. Interviews were carried out at the representatives' home campuses. Following the interviews, additional attempts to solicit comments on the proposed statement of commitment and strategies for presenting it to institutions for action were made by mail.

In September, 1972, another meeting of the Task Force was held which 7 representatives of institutions attended. Material distributed at this meeting included Suggested Means of Implementing Equal Opportunity in College Construction Programs and Highlights of Interviews with Institutional Representatives. It was agreed at this meeting that it would be desirable to broaden both the scope of concern and the membership of the project's effort. It was felt that the concern should be widened to include affirmative action for the whole field of institutional employment and the group's membership should include more institutions than those of higher education. The Human Resources Center agreed to pursue the possibility of funding for such a project. A proposal for An Affirmative Action Program for Colleges and Universities was prepared and submitted to the Title I (Higher Education Act) Administrator of the Department of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for consideration. Although it received favorable notice, research funds for Title I projects were impounded by the Federal Executive and the project could not be carried forward. HRC is presently seeking private foundation funding in order to continue this effort.

IV. Findings

As the project proceeded, it became apparent that there were two related but distinct questions to be dealt with:

(A) planning for social change within an institution to bring about equal employment opportunities for minorities in construction programs;

(B) planning for a cooperative structure in which institutions of different types and different levels of readiness and ability to respond might work together for social change.

The Findings are presented as they relate to these two aspects, although the two concerns were not considered separately during the life of the project.

A. Planning for Change within the Institution

There are a number of factors which relate to the willingness and ability of an institution to take action in the field of equal opportunity. The following were all apparent to some degree throughout the project and, although it is not possible to measure the degree of their influence, since this would vary with the institution, it is possible to identify them.

1. Student pressure. In the late 1960's and in 1970 and early 1971, student activism was a striking fact of academic life. Many participating institutions had experienced some such activity in greater or lesser degree and those that had not, had no reason to assume that this state would continue. The institutions who joined the consortium project were all sensitive to the possibility of student protest and even violence on their campuses. In response to an interview question*, "What kind of crisis might cause

* NOTE
This question and response, and all such following are drawn from the previously mentioned interview with institutional representatives to the project, conducted by HRC staff in April, May and June, 1972. Questionnaires are available in HRC Files.

your institution to take more action toward equal opportunity?" Almost half of those willing to make such a prediction (5 of 12) cited student demonstrations. Speakers at the fall conference representing other institutions with more fully developed equal opportunity programs in construction noted that student protests were an significant factor in bringing about such an institutional response.[12] Although concern about student demonstrations was high at the beginning of the project, by the closing months this concern had diminished, mirroring the rapid decline in student interest in social concerns of all types apparent on campuses throughout the country. To another interview question on recent student action on social issues, only 9 representatives reported any action relating to equal opportunity and none relating to employment on construction.

2. Government activities and interest. Executive Order #11246 which requires all contractors with the Federal government to take affirmative action toward equal employment was the principal expression of the Federal government's concern in the area of construction employment during the period of project activity. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has also developed regulations forbidding discrimination in construction work carried out by the General State Authority, the agency through which state-funded construction is administered. In discussing the effectiveness of the law as an agent for social change, Morroe Berger has stated:

---

12. Robert Albert, Tufts University.

"Virtually all the advances the Negroes have made have resulted from governmental policy and action in response to the pressure they have been able to exert alone or with allied movements."[13] In ranking groups who could influence institutions to take action for equal opportunity, institutional representatives in their interviews listed "government" second only to "trustees" in importance. "Students" as a group were rated fairly low in ability to influence, although as was previously noted, student demonstrations were seen by some representatives as the sort of crisis to which an institution would respond.

In the interviews, many institutional representatives noted that whatever provisions their institutions had made for equal opportunity in construction were simply whatever the government required. Luncheon speaker at the fall conference John Wilkes, then Director of the OFCC, laid great stress on the necessity of complying with Federal regulations.

However, as Berger also points out, "To achieve the full potentiality of law then requires constant use of the rights it protects and constant pressure for enforcement."[14] In recent months there has been confusion about the degree of commitment of the Federal government to equal opportunity. Contradictory reports have appeared in

---

13. Berger, Morroe, Equality by Statute: The Revolution in Civil Rights, revised edition, Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1968, p. 17.

14. Ibid., p. 62.

the press about the administration's withdrawal of support for the Philadelphia Plan, Philadelphia's application of Executive Order #11246, and in the December 19, 1972, issue of the New York Times an article appeared stating "The Nixon Administration has reportedly all but abandoned efforts to force Federal contractors to hire more blacks, other minority-group workers, and women." The article went on to report that the Office of Federal Contract Compliance was receiving "virtually no support and direction" from the administration.

The results of the state efforts at enforcement under the General State Authority were unknown since that agency does not allow the institutions where building was taking place to monitor projects but reserves that function for itself. At the time of the fall conference, it was the view of the subcommittee dealing with the General State Authority that progress toward equal opportunity on GSA projects had been slight.

3. Public pressures. Demonstrations of concern and protests from the minority community and the general public have also had an effect on institutional willingness to consider social change. Another conference speaker noted concern for community demonstrations as a factor in his institution's willingness to act in this area.[15] In recent months concern about the war in Southeast

---

15. Wesley Toles, Case Western Reserve University.

Asia and related political questions have absorbed the attentions of many in the white liberal community who had previously been active for equal opportunity and diverted the attention of the mass media. Minority groups retain their interest in a field so important to their economic progress but lack resources for wider action.

4. Cost and enrollment projections of institutions. Both costs and projected need influence proposed building plans on institutional campuses, and the combination of rising costs and fewer applications[16] have caused many colleges to revise their construction plans downward. Much of the construction reported by project participants in the survey taken in the early months of the project was completed or postponed indefinitely during the two-year period. During that period as well, the Pennsylvania Secretary of Education, John C. Pittenger, declared a freeze on construction at state-owned and state-related institutions in the state, in order to reevaluate the need for the projects. Three of the project participants, West Chester and Cheyney State Colleges and Temple University, were affected by this action in over $100 million worth of projects.

The combination of decreasing student activity on social concerns, confusion about the depth of government commitment to enforcement of equal employment opportunity regulations, a lack of

16. Schwartz, Berl, "Applications Drop at Major Colleges," Philadelphia Bulletin, August 22, 1971.

general public interest, the increasing cost and decreasing need for new construction exerted an increasingly negative influence as the project continued. This was reflected in a lessening of interest and participation on the part of institutional representatives. Where 30 institutions were represented at the initial Task Force meetings, 7 were represented at the final meeting and 9 at the meeting before that. During the life of the project 7 of the original 41 institutions withdrew, formally or informally, from participation by resignation or simple failure to appoint a new representative when the original representative was unable to continue.

Through the work of the Task Force and its subcommittees, the conference workshops and recommendations and the functioning of the Clearinghouse of Information, material was gathered and recommendations were developed on a specific action steps which an educational institution might utilize in a plan for developing equality of employment opportunity on construction projects. Recommendations were also made on possible areas of activity for the proposed consortium but these were not finalized; general areas which would have been pursued if the Consortium had become a functioning organization were monitoring, data collecting, and job training.

The recommended plan and guidelines for institutional action were presented to each participant under the title, Suggested Means of Implementing Equal Opportunity in College Construction Programs.

1. Adopt a stated commitment to equal employment opportunity in all college construction.

Many colleges and universities have already taken such action, at least in the form of a general statement on non-discrimination. Twenty-five of the institutions included in the interviews reported some form of equal employment opportunity policy in force at that time. Conference speakers representing other colleges and universities and the information gathered through the Clearinghouse stressed the importance of institutional commitment as a foundation for a successful affirmative action program. As previously stated, Federal regulations demand affirmative action efforts on any project using Federal funds.

2. Designate a specific office and individual within that office to be responsible for affirmative action programs.

The experience of the conference speakers again indicated that such assignment of responsibility and administrative support of the assignment was vital to the success of an equal opportunity program. It moves away from reliance on the contractor to monitor and enforce the institution's requirements and demonstrates to the institutional community and the community at large the seriousness of the commitment.

Colleges have approached the assignment of this responsibility in several ways: the establishment of a new position and a separate office such as Equal Opportunity Officer and Office of Affirmative

Action; the lodging of the responsibility in an existing administrative position such as personnel director, business manager or director of the physical plant. The variety of approaches is demonstrated somewhat in the variety of positions held by those persons designated to represent their institutions in planning for the consortium.

Two factors of concern to college administrators in the development of an equal opportunity program are cost and public relations. The possibility of short-range cost increases both in supporting the new function and in possible construction delays caused by application of the new requirements are a consideration. It must be remembered, however, that Federal funds carry with them requirements for affirmative action and there have been cases where building funds from the Federal government have been held up for lack of such programs. At this time there is no hard evidence to support the claim that affirmative action per se substantially increases the cost of a project[17] but there is every indication that continued denial of equal employment opportunity will be costly to our general social welfare.

3. Include affirmative action requirements as part of the contract specifications in all construction contracts.

This is the most common means by which the commitment to equal

---

17. The opposite is indicated in reports of the construction project carried out by the Bell Telephone Company in Newark, New Jersey. See "Crew 70% Black Erects Newark Building," New York Times, November 18, 1971.

employment opportunity is put into action, and is used by government agencies and private concerns as well as educational institutions. All such specifications should be designed with legal advice and it is recommended that government regulations be surveyed as a guide for minimum standards. In order to be effective, the project must be monitored to determine if the specifications are being met and contractors should be required to demonstrate that they are making efforts to meet them. Informal "good faith" efforts without contractual requirements may prove ineffective.

Educational institutions are already employing this tactic with some success. Harvard University, for example, includes Equal Employment Opportunities clauses in all major contracts for new construction. Article 4 of the construction contract for the Educational Facilities Building of the Harvard School of Public Health includes 10 sections specifying steps which the contractor shall take to comply with affirmative action requirements. The article is headed by the statement: "The contractor will maintain an affirmative action plan to assure equal employment opportunity throughout the performance of the work on this project." It goes on to cover manning tables, referral notices (recruitment procedures), job applicants, owner referral, subcontract provisions, minority subcontractors, training, reporting, equal employment officers and compliance.

Many agencies and institutions using contract compliance specifications to express affirmative action commitment have found

pre-award conferences with contractors a useful tactic. Since provisions of the affirmative action program apply to the subcontractors as well as to the prime contractor, pre-award conferences offer a channel for making information about its provisions available to them.

4. Insist that full apprentice-journeyman ratios be observed on construction projects.

The severely limited opportunities for minority workers to gain entrance to skilled trade unions in the construction field are at the root of the problem of equal employment opportunity. The Report on University Employment Policy in the Construction Trades cited earlier which was prepared by HRC for the University of Pennsylvania noted several factors operating to restrict the number of men allowed into the building trade unions. Limiting membership helps to guarantee work and negotiate high-paying contracts for members. It provides protection for members in case of a slow-down in the demand for construction. Union business agents are even more conservative and security-minded than the rank and file so the union leadership reinforces the bent of the membership. All of these factors operate without regard to racial discrimination but the Report notes that it is possible that subtle racial discrimination does exist in many unions in artificial barriers or double standards.[18]

---

18. A Report to President Gaylord P. Harnwell on the University of Pennsylvania Employment Policy in the Construction Trades, 1970, HRC Files, p. 15.

In most construction projects the educational institution does not deal directly with the unions but rather with the contractor who functions under his own agreements with them. It is therefore difficult for the institution to exert much pressure on the union membership procedures beyond the contract specifications dealing with equal employment opportunity. The question of ratio of apprentices to journeymen is an area, however, where the owner may exert some leverage. Apprentice ratios are developed through bargaining between unions and contractors, and specify the number of apprentices to journeymen allowed by trade. Construction projects do not generally have the full ratio of apprentices to journeymen because: (a) contractors fear it may cost them more because of time spent in training; (b) unions prefer to provide jobs for fully-qualified journeymen. Apprenticeship offers a training opportunity and an avenue of union membership to minority workers but the owner must exercise the same vigilance that is directed to the general work force.

Apprenticeship, it is true, offers the least important route to union membership for minority workers. Marshall and Briggs in their 1966 study note "Apprenticeship training is not quantitatively a very important means of improving Negro employment patterns."[19] But, they go on to state, "Qualitatively, however, apprenticeship

---

19. Marshall, F. Ray and Vernon M. Briggs, Jr., "Remedies for Discrimination in Apprenticeship Programs," Industrial Relations, reprinted by Workers Defense League-A. Philip Randolph Fund, N.Y.

is important to Negroes because it is the main (and sometimes the only) way to get into some trades in particular cities. Furthermore, we were surprised at the extent to which apprenticeship programs seem to be preparing future supervisory personnel in many occupations."[20]

5. Use minority contractors wherever possible.

The use of minority contractors is, in the view of many conference participants, the best quick avenue to providing jobs for minority workers. The principal obstacle to entering this avenue is the shortage of qualified black contractors. Dennis A. Derryck[21] notes that the number of black contractors in any major city is difficult to determine and quotes the Small Business Administration estimate of 8,000 in the nation (out of a total of 870,000 contractors). Many minority contracting firms are a single individual. Derryck notes a Ford Foundation-sponsored project on minority contractors which indicated that only 5 percent are capable of performing jobs in excess of $200,000.

Because they are small, minority contractors generally have not had much experience in preparing bids and making estimates on projects the size of those offered by educational institutions.

---

20. Ibid.

21. Derryck, Dennis A., The Construction Industry: A Black Perspective, Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C., 1972, p. 24.

Many minority firms are underfinanced and have problems obtaining loans, credit or bonds. Programs have been established to assist minority contractors with these problems such as the Minority Contractors Program in Philadelphia supported by the Urban Coalition and Model Cities.

Other educational institutions have reported general success in working with minority contractors and in developing supportive and educational programs.[22]

6. Use "set-asides" and joint ventures wherever possible in institutional construction projects.

"Set asides" are portions of a project or an entire project set aside for a contractor and awarded without competitive bidding. A joint venture is a contract undertaken jointly by more than one contractor. Both can be used to give minority contractors opportunities and experience. The joint venture would partner a minority contractor with a more experienced white contractor or would join together a coalition of minority contractors to undertake a project beyond the capacities of any one of them alone. Depending upon the agreements existing between the white contractor and the unions, joint venture is sometimes an avenue to union membership for the black contractor who is his partner on the project, and for that contractor's workmen.

---

22. Case Western Reserve University, Wesleyan University.

7. Assist the contractor in recuiting minority workmen.

The difficulty in finding qualified minority workmen is often advanced as a justification for lack of progress toward equal opportunity by both contractor and union. An early objection to the Philadelphia Plan voiced by the Human Resources Center[23] and others was that the responsibility for recruitment of qualified minority workmen was assigned only to the contractor. Lacking familiarity with the minority community, the contractor often does not know what channels to use to reach qualified minority workers, and, although the Office of Federal Contract Compliance maintains a list of community contacts for recruiting, the actual job of recruiting is no part of its responsibility. The willingness of the educational institution to share this responsibility with the contractor would demonstrate its seriousness and enlarge efforts to reach minority workers.

8. Use construction projects for training opportunities.

Although the development of training programs with the institutional construction projects as their site was viewed by Project participants as an activity to be carried on principally by the proposed consortium, it is possible for an individual institution to provide such opportunities itself. Federal grants were available under various manpower programs for such training activities which would actually be carried out by the project contractor.

23. HRC Testimony to U.S. Department of Labor Panel, Philadelphia, Pa., August 26, 1969, HRC Files.

Participants in the conference discussions on training indicated that they felt any training programs should be at the union entry level and should have union cooperation and participation.

9. Give attention to the educational institution's own work force.

A concern for equal employment opportunity throughout the whole spectrum of institutional employment was demonstrated by several of the project participants from the early days of planning for the consortium. The Minutes of the first Planning Committee Meeting[24] indicate that the question was raised at that time and it reappeared through the life of the project. Inclusion of the institution's own work force in affirmative action programming not only demonstrates the institution's commitment, but might serve to improve morale and avoid problems rising from discontent among the employes themselves, the student body, or the community. Federal regulations also require affirmative action in employment on the part of any institution or agency holding a government contract for research or services.

10. Apply affirmative action standards to all institutional suppliers or contractors.

This would demonstrate deep commitment to the goal of equal

24. Minutes of the Meeting, February 26, 1971, HRC Files.

opportunity and would be an extension of the institution's influence in the wider community. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has noted in its recent report The Campus and the City, "Each college and university must learn to assess its impacts - physical and environmental, economic, social and cultural - on the life of the city."[25] The report includes in its recommendations that "Colleges and universities seek to assist the surrounding areas through the operation of their employment and purchasing policies."[26]

The institution in pursuing this line of action might face public relations problems and might find that the amount of time and manpower required to investigate and monitor such a program would mean an increase in the resources devoted to the office assigned the affirmative action responsibility. It is being carried out at some institutions, such as Tufts University, however, and other agencies such as the City of Philadelphia have affirmative action requirements for their suppliers.

B. Planning for a Cooperative Structure.

The history of consortia in higher education in the United States dates back to 1925 with the establishment of the Claremont Colleges in California. College cooperation in the area of athletics has been common and generally accepted for many years, but

25. Op. cit., p. 17.
26. Ibid., p. 85.

cooperation today goes far beyond the sports field and symposium. In 1965-66, R. S. Moore[27] identified over one thousand cooperative arrangements of various kinds and purposes: bilateral arrangements, consortia without separate budgets, single purpose agreements, etc.

Consortia usually develop around academic and educational concerns which are shared by more than one institution. Evans[28] cites basic motivations in the 1950's for the development of inter-institutional cooperative arrangements as: increased enrollments, financial limitations and faculty shortages. Another observer of consortia, William C. Nelsen,[29] sees as areas offering potential for the development of consortia: curriculum development, improvement of teaching, admissions and retention of students, expanding educational opportunities, and inter-institutional financial and educational planning. Patterson[30] notes four purposes for the establishment of cooperative arrangements which are usually stated or implied in their principles:

---

27. Moore, Raymond S., Consortiums in American Higher Education 1965-1965-66, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1968.

28. Evans, Arthur H., Interinstitutional Cooperation in the Urban City: Some Hypotheses and a Case Study, City College of San Francisco, November, 1968, ERIC reprint ED037215.

29. Nelsen, William C., "Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Consortia," The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLIII, No. 7, (October, 1972), pp. 544-551.

30. Patterson, Lewis D., Consortia in American Higher Education, George Washington University, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C., November, 1970.

(1) to improve the quality of programs;

(2) to expand educational opportunities;

(3) to save money: and

(4) to relate more effectively with the outside community.

In connection with this last, which he sees as having an educational flavor (tutorial services, student placements with VISTA, sponsorship of special events), he goes on to say, "Consortia have not really explored the potential of cooperating with off-campus public. And until institutions are better able to relate to each other, they will find it awkward to regard this purpose as one of their major concerns. Not only does the need exist, however, but this arena offers a tremendous area for future growth."[31]

The current thinking on consortia in higher education, as reviewed by HRC staff and shared in part with project participants, indicates the importance of support from highest administrative levels and sufficient allowance of time for the successful development of cooperative arrangements. Patterson notes, "If a group of institutions truly are to live with each other, 'courting' time is a pre-requisite for them to become thoroughly acquainted, and the courting should start where most power is vested - with institutional presidents. If presidential cooperation does not exist, it is likely that little else will follow."[32] Edgar L. Sagan,

---

31. Ibid., p. 8.

32. Ibid., p. 3.

who carried out a detailed study of the processes of developing a consortia,[33] noted that the total project completion time from earliest informal discussion to fully operational organization was about five years. Formalization of the agreement took more than two years.

Diversity among participants is seen as both an asset and a liability. Evans[34] notes that diversity means different needs and therefore improves the possibility of cooperation; diversity also means different status and attitudes which can make cooperative activity more difficult. Robert J. Silverman in his study of consortia[35] suggests that diversity in prestige and kind of institution affects the performance of the institution within the cooperative arrangement.

Considering the factors which students of consortia have seen as influential in developing cooperation among institutions - purpose, administrative commitment, time, diversity - in relation to this project, it would seem that the project environment as it

---

33. Sagan, Edgar L., "An Analysis of the Processes of Developing a Consortium," paper presented to the Academic Consortia Seminar, Washington, D.C., October 8, 1969, ERIC reprint ED 033654.

34. Evans, op cit.

35. Silverman, Robert J., Study of Interorganizational Behavior in Consortia, Final Report, Cornell University, Cooperative Extension Service, Ithaca, New York, November, 1969, ERIC reprint ED 045056.

developed was not one to encourage the creation of a cooperative structure among the participating institutions. The purpose of the proposed consortium was one which was not directly related to the educational function of the institutions; indeed, it related to an area of action in which the institutions were not generally accustomed to act at all. Commitment of top administration to the consortium had not been achieved at the time of the project's completion, and the fact that the project had to work with a two-year time limit made it impossible to determine how long it would have taken to achieve such commitment, or if, in fact, it could have been achieved. The diversity of the participants acted as both asset and liability. It created areas of cooperation and information-sharing between smaller and larger institutions demonstrating a visible value of the cooperative effort, but it also made it difficult to achieve agreement on specific points or statements such as the Conference Recommendations or the Statement of Commitment. The project's experience would support the hypotheses of the previously-cited authors on the positive and negative aspects of diversity among participants in any effort to develop a cooperative structure, as well as the importance of top-level commitment and the necessity of allowing sufficient time for reaching understanding and agreement.

C. Final Status

At the completion of the two-year duration of the project, a formal consortium for equal opportunity in college construction had

not been established. In the light of research on consortium development cited earlier, this is not unexpected considering the purpose for which the consortium was intended and the need to develop high-level administrative commitment to it, as well as the need for each institution to adjust its own policies and actions to react to its individual situation. However, the increasingly negative influences of the factors which relate to social change, which were discussed in A. Planning for Change Within the Institution, suggest that, without some shift in these aspects, it would have been difficult formalize the consortium with all or a majority of the 34 institutions which remained in the project at the conclusion.

During the project, the value of opportunities and structures for institutional cooperation and exchange of information at a level less formal than that of an established consortium was demonstrated. The November, 1971, conference, the organization and operation of the Task Force and its subcommittees, the establishment of the Clearinghouse of Information, all offered opportunities for learning, discussion and sharing of information which would not have taken place without the motivation of planning for the consortium. Further testing of these means of institutional cooperation as effective stimuli for institutional change is recommended.

V. Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn as a result of the project experience and research.

A. An institution can have an effect on the composition of the work force on its construction projects. However, in order to achieve this end, it is necessary to establish policy and create a permanent administrative structure to manage and support the changes that are necessary to carry out the policy.

At the present time, it will be necessary for an institution to make a deliberate decision and take specific action in order to provide equal employment opportunity on its construction projects. The operation of the construction labor market and the enforcement efforts of governmental agencies will not bring about positive results for equal employment in themselves.

B. The force of law and public pressure both within and without the institution are effective spurs to social change. In order to bring about effective change, however, the pressure must be maintained , by constant and consistent enforcement of the law and by maintenance of public concern, until the response of the institution has become part of its regular functioning structure. Special programs, ad hoc committees, can be forgotten when the pressures are eased; a change that has become part of the normal operation of the institution will continue to be effective when public interest has waned.

C. The greatest need in the community, from the institutional point of view, for developing more employment opportunities for minority group persons, is a dependable and effective referral source for workers, contractors and suppliers. Since minority contractors and suppliers are frequently limited to the minority community as their field of operation, institutions, especially those smaller institutions in the mainly-white suburbs, have difficulty making contact with qualified minority workers and businessmen.

D. Research in consortium development indicates that the force for inter-institutional cooperation rises from matters of continuing institutional concern, supported by a larger public environment which either encourages action or presents problems beyond the capacities of a single institution to manage. Trying to develop a formal structure for cooperative action was not, in the case of the project's objectives, the most effective strategy. The necessary support from the public environment eroded over the project's two-year life as society began to experience a thrust away from equality. It is difficult to get commitment to an action program that does not have widespread societal consensus. Therefore, activity was limited to a Clearinghouse for Information and a coordination role, as far as the Human Resources Center was concerned.

E. The project experience suggests that, while it is difficult to develop a cooperative structure among institutions with

many different levels of response to the primary purpose, the attempt to create such a structure encourages action toward change among the individual participants. In other words, efforts to develop a cooperative program such as a consortium would be, in themselves, a strategy for bringing about change in the individual persons or institutions taking part in the effort. The successful development of a working cooperative structure, while desirable, would not be an absolute requirement for success of the strategy. If, on the other hand, creation of a working cooperative organization is the primary goal of the social change effort, great care should be taken in selecting participants with a high level of commitment to, and interest in, the purpose of the organization.

Bibliography

Bennis, Warren G., Kenneth D. Benne and Robert Chin. (eds.) The Planning of Change. Second edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Berger, Morroe. Equality by Statute: The Revolution in Civil Rights. Revised edition. New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., 1968.

Derryck, Dennis A. The Construction Industry: A Black Perspective. Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, D.C., 1972.

Downes, Anthony. Urban Problems and Prospects. Chicago: Markham Publishing Col, 1970.

Evans, Arthur H., Jr. Interinstitutional Cooperation in the Urban City: Some Hypotheses and a Case Study. City College of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif., November 1968, ERIC reprint ED 037215.

Grupe, Fritz H. Toward Realism in Initiating Collegiate Cooperative Centers. Loyola University, Chicago, Ill., March 1970, ERIC reprint ED 039838.

Hahn, William F. "Construction Manpower Needs by 1980." Monthly Labor Review. Vol. 94, No. 7, July 1971.

Marshall, F. Ray and Vernon M. Briggs, Jr. "Remedies for Discrimination in Apprenticeship Programs." Reprinted from Industrial Relations, Workers Defense League. New York: A. Philip Randolph Fund.

Minorities and Jobs. Foundation for Change, Inc., New York, September 1970, Revised December 1972.

Mitchell, Howard E. "The Human Resources Center of the University of Pennsylvania." University and the Urban Crisis. (Community Psychology Series, Issue II) in press, 1973.

Mitchell, Howard E., Marion B. Fox and James S. Roberts. A Report to President Gaylord P. Harnwell on the University of Pennsylvania Employment Policy in the Construction Trades. Human Resources Center, University of Pennsylvania, October 1970.

Moore, Raymond S. Consortiums in American Higher Education 1965-66. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Nelsen, William C. "Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Consortia." The Journal of Higher Education. Vol. XLIII, No. 7, October 1972.

Paltridge, James G. Urban Higher Education Consortia. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1971.

Patterson, Lewis D. Consortia in American Higher Education. George Washington University, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C., November 1970.

Poverty in Pennsylvania. Second Edition. Community Services of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa., November 1972.

Sagan, Edgar L. "An Analysis of the Processes of Developing a Consortium." Paper presented to the Academic Consortia Seminar, Washington, D.C., October 8, 1969, ERIC reprint ED 033654.

Silverman, Robert J. A Study of the Inter-Organizational Behavior in Consortia, Final Report. Cornell University, Cooperative Extension Service, Ithaca, New York, November 1969, ERIC reprint ED 045056.

Stuart, Reginald. Black Contractors' Dilemna. Race Relations Information Center, Nashville, Tenn., 1971.

The Campus and the City: Maximizing Assets and Reducing Liabilities. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New Jersey: McGraw-Hill, December 1972.

APPENDIX I

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Key to Symbols Used

LOCATION:	U = Urban S = Suburban
TYPE:	PR = Private P = Public S = State Owned SR = State Related PRSA = Private, State Aided
PROGRAM LEVEL:	U = Undergraduate G = Graduate 2-Y = Two Year Program
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION:	N = Nonsectarian S = Sectarian
SEXUAL CLASSIFICATION:	W = Women M = Men C = Coeducational

Institution	Location	Type	Program Level	Religious Affiliation	Sexual Classification
Beaver College	S	PR	U	NS	W
Bryn Mawr College	S	PR	U-G	NS	W
Bucks County Community College	S	P	2-Y	NS	C
Chestnut Hill College	S	PR	U	S	W
Cheyney State College	S	S	U-G	NS	C
Community College of Philadelphia	U	P	2-Y	NS	C
Delaware County Community College	U	P	2-Y	NS	C
Drexel University	U	PRSA	U-G	NS	C
Dropsie University	U	PR	G	NS	C
Eastern College	S	PR	U	NS	C
Eastern Baptist Seminary	S	PR	G	S	C
Ellen Cushing Jr. College	S	PR	2-Y	NS	W
Hahnemann Medical College & Hospital	U	PRSA	G	NS	C
Harcum Jr. College	S	PR	2-Y	NS	W
Haverford College	S	PR	U	NS	M
Holy Family College	U	PR	U	S	W
LaSalle College	U	PR	U	S	C
Lincoln University	S	SR	U	NS	C

Institution	Location	Type	Program Level	Religious Affiliation	Sexual Classification
Manor Jr. College	S	PR	2-Y	NS	W
Montgomery Cty. Community College	S	P	2-Y	NS	C
Moore College of Art	U	PR	U	NS	W
Pennsylvania College of Optometry	U	PRSA	U-G	NS	C
Pennsylvania State University Ogontz Campus Del. Cty. Campus	S	SR	2-Y	NS	C
Philadelphia College of Art	U	PRSA	U-G	NS	C
Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science	U	PR	U-G	NS	C
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science	U	PRSA	U	NS	C
Philadelphia Divinity School	U	PR	G	S	C
Philadelphia Musical Academy	U	PRSA	U	NS	C
Rosemont College	S	PR	U	S	W
St. Josephs College	U	PR	U	S	C
Spring Garden College	U	PR	U	NS	C
Swarthmore College	S	PR	U	NS	C
Temple University	U	SR	U-G	NS	C
Thomas Jefferson University	U	PRSA	G	NS	C

Institution	Location	Type	Program Level	Religious Affiliation	Sexual Classification
University of Pennsylvania	U	PRSA	U-G	NS	C
Ursinus College	S	PR	U	NS	C
Villanova University	S	PR	U-G	S	C
West Chester State College	S	S	U-G	NS	C
Westminster Seminary	S	PR	U-G	S	C
Widener College	Small City	PR	U	NS	C

APPENDIX II

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON PLANNING A CONSORTIUM FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

University of Pennsylvania
November 13, 1971

Human Resources Center
3810 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

A BRIEF FOREWORD
TO

REPORT OF CONFERENCE ON PLANNING CONSORTIUM
FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Human Resources Center
University of Pennsylvania
November 13, 1971

Attached is the "Report of the Conference on Planning A Consortium for Equal Opportunity," held at the University of Pennsylvania, November 13, 1971. The Report has been edited by the Human Resources Center staff as judiciously as possible. We have sought to retain not only the content but the emotional tone of the statements made by the Workshop participants.

We feel that the participants have provided us with an important document, already we have learned much from it in this important area. It is recommended for your study as the basis for future deliberations in developing the Consortium. Of special interest are the "Recommendations of Workshop Sessions". The fact that the recommendations show a degree of over-lap from a variety of workshops was not eliminated, because we felt this demonstrated a measure of emphasis in suggested areas of policy formulation.

The Human Resources Center staff appreciated the cooperation of you and your institution in this mutual endeavor during 1971 and are pleased to be in a position to coordinate further activities in 1972.

Howard E. Mitchell, Ph.D.
Director, Human Resources Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Introduction 1

Proceedings 2

Appendices 14

A. Text of Address by President Martin Meyerson
University of Pennsylvania

B. Text of Address by Mr. John Wilks
Office of Federal Contract Compliance
U.S. Department of Labor

C. Summary of Recommendations from Workshops and
Task Force Committees

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON PLANNING A CONSORTIUM FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, NOVEMBER 13, 1971

I. Background: History and Goals

The Universities Consortium Project[1] developed out of a Human Resources Center research project to design a model plan for increased utilization of minority workers and contractors on university construction projects.[2] The current project moves toward the development of this plan through the organization of a Task Force of educational institutions in the five-county south-eastern Pennsylvania area. The Task Force, working through seven ad hoc committees with a community-based advisory council, aims at the establishment of a Consortium for equal opportunity in building programs.

The goals proposed for the Conference itself were four:

1. To provide a forum for discussion with concerned organizations from the five-county area and with local, state and national officials with expertise in the problem areas of employing minorities in all aspects of building and construction;

2. To present to the Task Force institutions, information on the urgent problem of minority employment in university projects;

3. To carry out policy planning in workshops and present those policies to the Conference;

4. To explore strategies for implementation of a Consortium and the adoption of recommended programs.

II. Participants

Almost 200 invitations were sent to representatives of forty-one colleges and universities in the five-county area; members of the advisory council representing builders, labor and concerned community organizations; and representatives of local, state and federal agencies

---

[1] This project has been supported by Grant No. 71089004 Title 1, Higher Education Act (1965) administered through the Dept. of Education

[2] Howard D. Mitchell, et al., A Report to President Gaylord P. Harnwell on the University of Pennsylvania Employment Policy in the Construction Trades (Human Resources Center, Univ. Of Penna., 1969) Mimeo.

dealing with equal employment opportunity. More than eighty persons actually participated in the Conference, including forty representatives from twenty area colleges and universities, and forty representatives from community organizations, the construction industry and governmental agencies.

II. Proceedings of Conference

A. Introduction

The Conference was opened by Dr. Howard E. Mitchell, Director of the Human Resources Center, and the welcoming address was given by President Martin Meyerson of the University of Pennsylvania. Members of the afternoon panel were introduced and reported briefly on programs at their universities. Panelists were:

Mr. Robert Albert, Director
Office of Equal Opportunity and Intergroup Relations
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts

Mr. John Moran, General Manager of Planning
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

Mr. Wesley Toles, Associate Director
Office of Urban Affairs
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

Mrs. Marion Fox, Project Coordinator, then outlined the plan for the day. Participants were asked to work in one of the following eight workshops on specific areas:

Utilization of Minority Contractors
Minority Hiring and Training Program Development
Extending Equal Opportunity to Private College Building
Methods of University Monitoring of Employment
University Curriculum as an Aid
Equal Employment Policies under the Pennsylvania General State Authority
Policy and Goal Formation for the Consortium
Orientation

The principal address of the day was given at the luncheon by Mr. John L. Wilks, Director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, U.S. Department of Labor.

The afternoon program included presentation of specific recommendations from the seven topic-oriented workshops, followed by a critique of the recommendations by the aforementioned three-member panel, moderated by Dr. Jefferson B. Fordham, former Dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania.

B. Summary of President Meyerson's Address

The address of President Martin Meyerson, University of Pennsylvania (Appendix A) stressed the importance of universities and colleges taking a strong stand in hiring and training of minority groups in their building programs. In a nation that spent more than 90 billion dollars in construction in 1970, which employs some 3,350,000 workers, only 2% of unionized workers are non-white. Universities have a special role in working toward a solution of these inequalities through building programs on their own campuses. Universities and colleges must see how they can create new opportunities for non-whites in skilled jobs, how they can develop employment policies feasible for unions, for contractors as well as institutions of higher education. This is the important task facing us.

C. Summary of Panelists Remarks at Morning Session

Each of the three panelists representing other universities was called on at the introductory session to describe briefly the programs in force at his institution.

Mr. Wesley Toles, Case Western Reserve University

In discussing Case Western Reserve's program during the past four years, Mr. Toles stressed that they have concentrated on action, not research or publicity. The University's proximity to the Hough area

has encouraged their concern in the area of minority employment. He noted that in the past four years they have carried out a $1 million construction program in which seven contractors with all-black or part-black work forces have been included, four contractors in more than one project. Contracts have included mechanical work, electrical work, masonry, plastering, tile and wrecking. In 1968 the University developed a pre-apprenticeship, on-the-job training program to help minority workers pass examinations for union membership. They have also developed, with the help of Turner Construction Company, a one-semester program in bidding and estimating for black contractors. They have promoted the development of joint ventures with black and white contractors. They have recommended contractors and refused to deal with firms not offering equal employment opportunity. Case Western Reserve is also involved in the Cleveland Equal Opportunity Plan.

Mr. Robert Albert, Tufts University

Tufts University's active concern with equal employment opportunity began with a student demonstration in 1968 protesting the composition of the University's work force. They now maintain a requirement for 20% non-white workers in all work forces for University projects. They make this requirement clear to contractors before bids are let and they enforce it strictly. He urged colleges to "go it alone" in this area if necessary, since Executive Order 11246 applies to all construction under Federal funding and is in itself all the justification necessary. He recommended that all contractors be informed of the requirements when they first study the plans and that all bids be required to include projections, timetables and goals. This policy should be strictly followed. He also noted that the non-construction work force at Tufts had risen from 4.3% non-white to 7.9% non-white during the past ten months.

Mr. John Moran, Princeton University

Princeton now has 22% overall minority employment on University construction contracts with 16% average minority employment in skilled trades. In 1969, the University asked cooperation from contractors and unions in increasing minority employment on University projects. The very limited success of this voluntary approach led to the adoption, in 1970, of firm policies under which the University requires all bids to include the percentage of minority employment projected, timetables for achievement, and states that it will actively seek minority contractors. Since more non-union firms are, as a consequence involved, the University voluntarily requires payment of prevailing wages (usually union wage scales). The University has supported two minority contractors with potential for expansion through guarantees and assistance in finding bonding. He feels that their success to date has been due in part to the fact that most projects have been small and pressure can be more effectively applied to all concerned.

D. Summary of Workshop Sessions and Recommendations

Workshops were conducted by each of the ad hoc committees in their special areas. Committees had prepared some items for discussion by both newcomers and previous committee members. The committees formulated recommendations which were presented by the workshop chairman to the whole Conference at the afternoon session. (For complete statement of Workshop recommendations see Appendix C).

Utilization of Minority Contractors (Mr. Frank Betts, Chairman)

This committee deals with the utilization of and assistance to minority contractors. About fifteen participants attended this meeting, representing: Spring Garden College, Temple University, University of Pennsylvania, Montgomery County Community College, Thomas Jefferson University, Urban Coalition, Opportunities Industrialization Center,

Community Legal Services, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, Philadelphia Association of Minority Contractors, Pennsylvania Departments of Property and Supplies, Community Affairs, Transportation. Much of the group's time was spent in discussing the problem of racism in the construction trades, and ways in which the existing system supports and reinforces racist attitudes and actions, such as exclusion of minority groups from training programs and employment opportunities.

Minority Hiring and Training Program Development (Mr. S. Lee Varker, Chairman)

This committee deals with encouragement and setting of standards for minority hiring and training in (a) union and (b) suburban non-union areas including apprenticeship, journeyman training, utilization of minority workers and college maintenance skill programs; transportation and special hiring methods in suburban and non-union areas. About seventeen participants attended this meeting, representing : Pennsylvania State University-Delaware County, University of Pennsylvania, Temple University, Spring Garden College, Association of Builders and Contractors, Lawyers Committee on Human Rights, Urban League, Jewish Employment & Vocational Service, Opportunities Industrialization Center, Community Legal Services, Urban Coalition, AFL-CIO, League of Women Voters. There was a high level of participation; participants felt strongly that before any program could be successful a written guarantee of commitment from unions was basic.

Extending Equal Opportunity to Private College Building (Mr. J. K. Lee Smith, Chairman)

The concern of this committee is increasing equal employment opportunities in privately funded college building. About eight participants attended this meeting, representing: Eastern Baptist College, Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science, Drexel University, Harcum Junior College, University of Pennsylvania, AFL-CIO, Citizens of

Tioga-Nicetown. The participants put priority on the recommendation to broaden the base of the Consortium. There was also strong interest in the proposal to improve the public school curriculum in vocational education and develop an agreement for union acceptance of graduates, and the request for a guarantee from unions of projected increases in minority membership.

Methods of University Monitoring of Employment (Mr. Andrew Sullivan, Chairman)

This committee deals with developing new and stronger techniques for colleges to monitor employment under the Philadelphia Plan. About ten participants attended this meeting, representing: University of Pennsylvania, Community College of Philadelphia, Amalgamated Plumbers Sweeney Construction Corp., Conduit and Foundation Corp., Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, regional office of Office of Federal Contract Compliance. The discussion centered largely on the question of responsibility and accountability of the institution and its degree of commitment. It was suggested that a conference be held for institutional Equal Employment Opportunity officers to encourage their personal commitment to equal opportunity.

University Curriculum as an Aid (Mr. Van B. Bruner, Jr., Chairman)

This committee deals with utilizing special college curricula and faculty resources for training, testing or research and data development. About eight participants attended this meeting, representing: Spring Garden College, Pennsylvania State University, Roofing & Sheet Metal Contractors, Peabody & Wind Engineers, School District of Philadelphia. The main point of discussion was on how to motivate behavior patterns to work orientation in training programs.

Equal Employment Policies under the Pennsylvania General State Authority (Dr. Herman Niebuhr, Chairman)

This committee deals with increasing equal opportunity on G.S.A. projects, and monitoring and enforcement on G.S.A. projects. About six participants attended this meeting, representing: Lincoln University, LaSalle College, Temple University, the Pennsylvania General State Authority and the League of Women Voters. The group felt most strongly that pressure must be put on the G.S.A. to make it more assertive in following its own rhetoric with appropriate action.

Policy and Goal Formation for the Consortium (Mrs. Marion Fox, Chairman)

This committee deals with development of consortium policy and was the committee which planned the Conference itself. About six participants attended this meeting, representing: Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital, University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University-Ogontz, Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations, Pennsylvania Department of Education. Recommendations on consortium policy and goals from other pre-Conference committee reports had been prepared as a basis for beginning discussion. Main points of interest included: cost level of contracts to be included under equal opportunity requirements; broadening the consortium base; a cost study; writing requirements into contracts with penalties included; attention to privately funded college building and G.S.A. construction; more definitive goals; inclusion of construction trade suppliers under provisions for equal opportunity actions.

Orientation (conducted by Dr. Edward Cahill)

This was a brief session to give an overview of the area of equal employment for Conference participants with little previous knowledge of the project. Those attending then went on to participate in topic-oriented workshops. About five persons took part in this session.

E. Summary of Address by Mr. John L. Wilks

Mr. Wilks, Office of Federal Contract Compliance, U.S. Department of Labor (See Appendix B for complete text),commented on the importance of colleges recognizing the concerns of students for social justice. Colleges and universities can help the government to do its job of eliminating descrimination by keeping proper records and supporting enforcement of laws.

The OFCC has been undermanned since its inception. Today there are only 400 people administering a program that affects one-third of the total work-force in the country and more than 250,000 contractors.

The Philadelphia Plan presents low ranges of minority employment - the OFCC has authority beyond that - but it was recognized that it was important to be reasonable.

Apprenticeship programs are important as a way into the unions yet only about 30% of union people today worked through apprenticeship programs themselves.

Within the Philadelphia Plan are options for hometown solutions. None of them are panaceas. The important aspect is to get people on the job. An unanticipated bonus in the voluntary aspects of the Philadelphia Plan is the presentation of bid specifications so that if a tri-partite group comes up with a given number of slots it may be acceptable. Thus every contractor who bids must sign that he is a

member, his contractors association and his unions are members of this local plan.

OFCC is still in the process of learning how to set standards and in the process of automating all construction contractors. Reporting procedures now require contractors to report monthly to their agencies.

The Philadelphia Plan is working despite what you read about attitudes in the newspapers. Minorities are getting jobs. Contractors are being brought to count for failure to comply.

What you need to do is develop standards, a reporting system, a system of evaluation and determine what you are going to do with it when you get it.

F. Summary of Panel Critique and Comments on Recommendations of Workshop Sessions

Panelists were Robert Albert (Tufts University), John Moran (Princeton University) and Wesley Toles (Case Western Reserve University The session was moderated by Jefferson Fordham (Professor of Law and former Dean of University of Pennsylvania School of Law).

Mr. Moran: Regarding the use of minority contractors or subcontractors, institutions should make a strong effort to use minority contractors on small contracts. Princeton does this to encourage the growth of small contractors. On financing, he suggested directly guaranteeing payment to suppliers, which Princeton does.

Dean Fordham asked how this related to the normal staging of payments.

Mr. Moran: The suppliers are more relaxed and willing to wait. Princeton also pays minority contractors frequently and promptly. He recommends that institutions not require bonding if this is possible or else assist contractor in getting it.

From the floor the question was asked: Does Princeton also guarantee payment for suppliers of subcontractors?

Mr. Moran: So far, this problem hasn't come up.

Mr. Toles: Small contractors have a real problem with suppliers Suppliers give 30 days to small contractors but big companies owe them all the time. Case Western Reserve intervenes with suppliers and guarantees payment but has not actually made any payments.

Mr. Albert: Institutions continually refuse to understand their obligations under Executive Order 11246. They should write into their contracts exactly what they require and what they will do and then monitor their projects. Contractors don't want to be treated in a paternalistic way. Tufts follows business-like procedures to make money available through banks to small contractors so they can pay their own bills, and makes joint ventures with white contractors available for large projects. The institution must make its requirements clear to all contractors at the outset.

Mr. Toles: At Case Western Reserve they haven't yet had a problem they couldn't meet. The important thing is institutional commitment. The consortium must get this clear from the start.

Mr. Moran: Use of minority contractors is a very important part of the whole area.

Dean Fordham: Are there any special problems in competitive bidding?

Mr. Moran: At Princeton, the minority contractors win their share. In New Jersey there is a state program to help small contractors develop their bids.

Mr. Albert: At Tufts someone on the staff helps minority contractors. They have developed a program for minority contractors to learn how to bid. They also set aside a block of jobs for minority contractors. Large contracts are written so that general contractors must include minority contractors in the project.

A comment from Narva Harris (Philadelphia Assn. of Minority Contractors): "Some of these programs have been tried in Philadelphia and haven't worked. If all that is going to be said is 'encourage the use of minority contractors,' we could have left at 9:30. Wording should be better than that." He urged setting aside large contracts in joint ventures and strengthening minority contractors gives best hope of providing more jobs for black workers.

Mr. Albert: indicated that he is "a little appalled" not to hear recommendations to make the Consortium stronger to do the kinds of things Mr. Harris is suggesting. You should guarantee at the outset "what games you're going to play." He hasn't heard recommendations to amalgamate, build internal training programs, challenge unions, make requirements to use trainees. All these mechanisms are available. Tufts is using these. Forty-one schools can do a great deal if they will

Mr. Toles: Turner Construction Company helped Tufts with the seminar on bidding for minority contractors, as well as a Cleveland bank and others. The president of Turner Construction is now working with his subcontractors. If you get people turned on to the idea they will work on it themselves. The Consortium can learn from the unions and contractors how to get things done.

Mr. Albert: The Consortium should also pay attention to the Metropolitan Recruitment Statistical Area. As contractors go from job to job, they extend their Area. Institutions should make sure that contractors are using their whole Area for recruitment.

From the floor, Mr. Elmer Taylor (Amalgamated Plumbers) commented that there is a real need for trained workers to put on the contracts. Funds are needed for training. He described his efforts to provide training opportunities.

Panel responds: Local people should help develop contacts to get funds for training programs.

A brief discussion followed concerning the merits of adhering to union regulations for training programs and apprenticeship. There was no agreement on length of time for apprenticeships but there was agreement that the criteria should be whether or not the person can do the job expected. If so, then the union should accept them.

Mr. Toles: At Tufts he had the experience of bringing a whole shop into the union. The skilled men are 'out there'. What is needed is a recruiting program. They do not need to come through an apprenticeship program.

Melvin Wind: He supports Mr. Taylor in his desire for a full training program. The less-trained lose their jobs in recession periods

Mr. Toles: Cleveland did not lower their standards. The Cleveland Opportunity Plan rates the men.

Dean Fordham: then called for closing statements from panelists

Mr. Harris: He supports training program, not five years of apprenticeship, for instance.

Dean Fordham: Institutional commitment is vital.

Mr. Moran: He supports "set-asides" as an institutional commitment which must be made. On the question of added costs, he considered research in this area a waste of time. The institutions will be ahead of the game, even if the immediate costs are somewhat higher.

Mr. Albert: He would say to all members of the Consortium, each has an obligation under Executive Order 11246 which each has the responsibility to implement. Forty-one schools together doing affirmative action plans would be wonderful but he doesn't want to see too much time spent on studies, more committees and so forth. Action is the important thing.

Mr. Toles: In 1967 Case Western Reserve made a commitment to affirmative action as its stated policy on all projects and it has been carried out. It is made clear to all that this is part of doing business at Case.

Closing:

Mrs. Fox stated that the next steps will be to develop a policy statement from the Conference recommendations for colleges and universities to consider. She urged those college representatives attending, to work to develop expanded committees of support at their own institutions including students, trustees, representatives of building departments and other administrative officers. She announced that the Human Resources Center will continue its planning and development for the Consortium, providing that Title I, HEA continues its support for the project in 1972.

APPENDIX A

Text of Address by President Martin Meyerson

Howard Mitchell commented that I was at the State University of New York at Buffalo, before returning to Pennsylvania. I remember so well the time that you visited with us there. It was in the midst of the most difficult deliberations, for the State University at Buffalo has the largest campus building program in the world that had just gotten started, and we called a moratorium on that construction program it was a construction program of $650 million - and we called a moratorium on it bacause the trade unions in that area were not prepared to take on blacks and other minority group members except in the unskilled tasks that had been the common pattern previously.

For a year and a half that campus did not proceed because those of us who were there and who were responsible for these decisions felt that it was more important to have achievement on the employment side than it was to have those buildings put up. A training program was developed The unions reluctantly agreed, the contractors reluctantly agreed, and the state government, perhaps even more reluctantly, agreed. Today the campus is now under way. It still has to prove itself, in terms of the training programs, the hiring programs.

What I'm trying to suggest here may have very great significance to the mission you're undertaking today. I'd like to emphasize that the act of building is an act of faith based on belief in the future of human possibilities, of human abilities, but it's also intensely practical. The construction of houses, of factories, of office buildings, of theaters, of schools, of churches and of other structures is one of the major industries of our world. Last year the total value of new construction that took place in this country was over $91 billion and nobody has good estimates on remodeling. Our university has $39 million of construction now in progress, and in the last score of years we have put up well over $200 million in new building.

Now all of these figures represent an enormous number of manhours of work and of wages paid. That is why the statistics on minority employment for contract construction are so disturbing. With 3,350,000 people now employed in construction in the United States and about 2,270,000 are union members, only about 2% are non-white. Out of a total of more than 793,000 carpenters - a skilled trade - about 6/10 of 1% are black. In Philadelphia the record is slightly better but still dismal. Of the 8,000 blacks in building trade unions, 4% are in general construction, 2.6% are in mechanical work and over 90% are laborers.

Now there are laws on the books to help improve these statistics, but they are laws that need teeth, and we need to make special efforts to monitor what's going on and to see that these laws are, indeed, enforced. For example, at our university through the stimulus of Howard Mitchell and Frank Betts, who is with us today, and others, the Trustees now require the use of the Philadelphia Plan on all university construction projects of $500,000 or more, whether or not there are Federal funds involved. But that Plan, of course, has very many weaknesses. Although the Plan does focus opinion on the scarcity of minority workers in construction, it does not meet certain fundamental objections of contractors and of unions, and has not yet proved a major source of career employment in the non-white community.

For example, it does not require career training. That great humorist, Mark Twain, once wrote: "Training is everything. The peach was once a bitter almond. Cauliflower is nothing but cabbage with a college education." An exaggeration, of course, but he makes the point, providing an insight on one aspect of the problem of improving employment opportunities for minority groups.

Now, given our desire to help, the question of how higher education institutions should proceed is critical. A report prepared by the University Human Resources Center noted influences acting to shape the employment practices and policies at our institution. They probably are true for others as well. These influences include those of the surrounding community, events at other universities or in other cities relating to minority employment in the building trades, and the internal situation of the institution in question, including current employment. These are strong forces that need a considered response. How can we create new career opportunities for non-whites in skilled jobs through new programs of training, of up-grading, of hiring? How can we develop employment policies that are feasible for unions, for contractors as well as for institutions of higher education?

This Conference represents, I believe, the first endeavor to form a consortium on an aspect of university-community relations - the development of policies and methods, to assist in solving inequalities of opportunity for employment on campus buildings. Through it we can attempt to form a common set of goals and policies adapted to our individual institutional need, make use of the opportunity to provide leadership to our larger community through the joint strength of our educational institutions, act as partners for equal employment with government, contractors, labor and the community in our role as builders. Universities and colleges ought to be leaders in the field of equal opportunity by example. We should devise models which will stimulate others and draw on our variegated resources of knowledge.

I gather that the colleges and universities participating in this Conference have well over $200 million of construction now in process,

and that by 1976 that figure may be well over twice that in size. And that year, of course, is the year of our nation's and our community's Bicentennial. What better contribution could we make to this celebration than to have implemented a plan to forward the goals we so often present as the fundamental creed of our country. Such an accomplishment would be worth far more than any ceremonies.

APPENDIX B

Text of Address by Mr. John L. Wilks

Well, I think this conference in many ways reflects an awareness on the part of the universities that they, too, are a part of contemporary America; that they, too, must seek to carry out their responsibilities as citizens in a community whose complexion is changing - or there are going to be problems. ...Government itself hasn't been very responsive and really that's the very sad part because certainly the role of representative government is to place into positions those persons who will reflect that which is good for the society.... You expect your representative to look out and force you, if necessary, to do that which is in the interest of all. And our government hasn't done that very much in the areas in which we are concerned, as a result of that, you're in trouble, or you're going to be in trouble.

You're going to be in trouble because of students. Their changing interests, moving away from materialism and toward the human side of existence. And you're going to be in trouble because of the change in attitude of minorities toward power, and how you relate to power. The concept of revolution or evolution no longer causes young people to run, except to consider revolution. So we've got a different kind of ball game because government really hasn't done its thing. Your representatives haven't forced government and society to do the kinds of things that would make this meeting today unnecessary, so that's why you're here....Because we've already taken one contractor to a debarment - the first under the Federal program - (a contractor who was one of your contractors here) and because the university had done its job of keeping records, then we were able,along with the other work we did, to find that contractor in non-compliance and get a recommendation of debarment by the hearing officer. This was sustained by Secretary Richardson and approved by me.

APPENDIX B cont'd.

On the Office of Federal Contract Compliance and the Philadelphia Plan

Since 1965 the Office of Federal Contract Compliance has been under the present name. But since Roosevelt there has been concern on the part of the Federal government that there should be no discrimination where Federal funds are concerned. In 1969, OFCC had 26 authorized slots - 26 professional and non-professional combined - with the responsibility of administering the Federal government's compliance program for 250,000 contractors. The Federal agencies who directly go out and look at contractors and have the authority to operate the program at that level had about 350 people in all 26 agencies. We had about 400 people administering a program that affects one-third of the total work force in the country. The Civil Rights Commission completed its study in '69 and passed it on to Secretary Schultze, pointing out that no administration had even supported the program from the standpoint of resources or allowing it to enforce regulations. It said also that the Office had not developed standards for agencies and for contractors so therefore the whole field was confused.

Well, we (Art Fletcher and I) began with that as our guideline. We were going to deal with those deficiencies. So we immediately decided that construction was the area in which we should make our thrust forward. We had to define affirmative action, because affirmative action is the guts of the Executive Order. We defined affirmative action as goals and timetables - very, very nitty-gritty. Everything else is call-it-what-you-will, but the only thing we were concerned about was that if you're talking about taking affirmative action, the question is how many, when?

In addition to that, we recognized that the Federal Contract Compliance program should be more directly related to the Federal procurement system, and we were determined to move into that system so that we could take advantage of all the other contracting offices in the Federal government. We wanted to put them in a position where, when a decision was made to go forward with a contract, that contracting officer has made a commitment and he was responsible.

That's what the Philadelphia Plan is all about. That's why we have all the confrontation about the Philadelphia Plan - because we were moving out of the civil rights rhetoric arena into an arena where a contractor could be held because he had made a firm commitment that could be monitored and that he could be brought to task for. The unions the contractors said 'no, that's a quota and that's illigal.'

Well, you know the story because really, the Philadelphia Plan is your plan. It was implemented because after a public hearing it became crystal clear that it was the feeling of the community that the only kind of plan that would be useful here would be one that would be an imposed plan and not a volunteer plan that would depend upon the goodness of the industry to perform.

We're dealing with the practicalities that exist - and yet we want to be reasonable. Therefore, when the Philadelphia Plan was imposed, we only included Federal work. We had the authority to go beyond that, and we knew it, but we didn't want to do that. We wanted the numbers and the ranges to be low because, again, we recognize that it was important that we be reasonable. We recognized and we hoped that the industry people would take us to court - all the way to the Supreme Court. That's what we wanted to happen. Because the sooner that happened, the sooner we could put aside the issue of whether or

not the government has the right to set standards, numerical standards, where it's spending its money.

Well, that has happened, and again, Philadelphia, we thank you for help in making that possible....

On Training

I want to deal with that training business because the President mentioned it this morning. One of the criticisms we get about the Philadelphia Plan is that it just doesn't have a training mechanism there. Well, don't you believe that's necessary, because the Philadelphia Plan will be successful. We know as a result of the public hearing that if we don't train anybody for the next three years, there are enough craftsmen in this area who can walk on the jobs and do them. That's a gimmick - the training. Because you have the shipyards here, you have the non-union contractors here. Sure, they need some upgrading of their skills. Industry normally trains its own on the job. Every contractor trains you in the way in which he does his thing, so there's nothing really unusual about that.

Apprenticeship programs? We believe in apprenticeship programs. Our problem with apprenticeship programs is, they never let black folks in. So now that we're saying, you've got to have an imposed plan, they want to now open up the doors for apprenticeship programs - which we welcome. We think it's good. If you're 17 or 18 and you want to get into a craft, you ought to go into an apprenticeship program. We don't think you should do that if you're 37,38 and you've been scuffling around making a living the best you could. You've developed some skills however, and now you're told that you must go into an apprenticeship program. Now we don't believe that. We know for a fact that

only about 30% of the people in the unions worked through apprenticeship programs.

On Philadelphia Plan Options

Out of the Philadelphia Plan is an option which is talked about-volunteerism, home-town solution, which was really an escape hatch for those who thought that they could get together and work out a volunteer program that might be equally workable. We got some successes with that and we've had some failures with it. We have about 39 volunteer programs around the country, at one stage of development or another But let me say that our attitude toward the Philadelphia Plan, our attitude toward the home-town solution is that none of them are panaceas and if you come up with a better plan tomorrow, we want to know about it. We only want to get people on the job and we must have some standards. These are our standards today. Tomorrow they may be different, if tomorrow we can come up with something that we think can be done better. But it must stand the test of what we have done. We know a lot more now than we did two years ago so that when you come with your plan, make it a good one. We know something now about what may or may not work.

We do have something, however, in the home-town plan which was not anticipated. It's kind of a little bonus for us and an opportunity for industry people. We have bid specifications, the same as we do in the Philadelphia Plan. We have now combined the Philadelphia Plan with the volunteer plan so that if a tri-part group comes up with an agreement of 400 or 500 or whatever number of slots per year, we accept that. Then we immediately issue bid specifications which say that, under part one, every contractor who bids must sign that he is a member

his contractors association and his union are both members of this local plan. Therefore on each project he does not have to set a numerical goal. However, if that is not the case, we have interpolated the numbers from part one into a part two which is really a Philadelphia Plan with ranges over the same period of time. At any such time that he, functioning under part one, and his craft, are deemed not to have performed we automatically just erase part one and he's under an imposed plan. We have 13 imposed plans of that sort around the country now and we anticipate that we will have bid specifications for every so-called volunteer plan.

On New Plans

So what we're doing is learning as we go along how to set standards, how to try to make them workable, and also how to monitor them. We also intend to automate. We are in the process of automating all construction contractors. We anticipate having that done within a matter of months. Because we now have reporting procedures that require the contractors to report monthly to their agencies. The fact is, as many of you know having worked in Federal agencies, we just don't have the manpower.

About manpower, let me tell you what we've done. I said that we had 26 people in 1969. We now have 119. There were about 350 in the Federal agencies. This year we are authorized 1540. So the administration is assisting us with manpower. In addition, since Secretary Schultz went over to OMB, we have some other things going. We now recommend the contracting agencies budget allowance for the year. We set their workload. We send to OMB a budget memorandum which says that

this agency should get X number of dollars because it's going to do: one, two, three,four. Therefore, when that agency comes up for its allotment each year, OMB will be in a position to look at our reports of how well they performed on that money which they received. Another little problem we discovered was that because of the decentralization and the control of administrators in the field, quite often money was allocated to a given region and never ended up with more resources in compliance. This will help deal with that problem.

On The Success of the Philadelphia Plan

But how is the Philadelphia Plan working? Some of you here must be very confused, because if I only know what I read in the papers I would be very confused. The fact is that the Plan is working very well. The fact is that all of the stories you read don't deal with the Plan, they deal with attitudes that people have about the Plan. Well, we know what those are. One thing we were surprised about, was the discovery that many of the minorities working on the projects didn't know about the Philadelphia Plan. That was a very interesting discovery but I suppose when you really think about it, there's no reason why they should know. They've got a job and that's what's important and we have a responsibility to see that they have one. But when you talk with them about the Philadelphia Plan per se, many of them don't know what they're talking about. It's very easy to get a very mixed picture if you go out in the community.

We know that in terms of getting jobs, we're getting there. Now this doesn't mean that all the contractors conform. Even though the percentage of manhours is at the upper level of the ranges, there are a number of contractors, about 20, that we have to deal with. I don't

know if it's been announced yet but HUD will have two debarment hearings in November...HEW has three that I've been watching for a long time, they will be getting a hearing schedule within the next 30 days either by them or by us. SBA has at least one contractor who will be coming to hearing. This is also happening in Washington which is the other imposed plan that has been in existance long enough to look at. We're also doing equally well in terms of manhours but we have contractors there that we have to deal with. We now have five imposed plans -- that's Philadelphia, Washington, San Francisco, St. Louis, Atlanta. In St. Louis, we've just had the first project under the plan.

On The Future of the Consortium

I would like to say that I hope you move to develop some standards, develop a reporting system, develop a system of evaluation and determine what you are going to do with it when you get it. Are you going to put it in a drawer, are you going to publicize it? What are you going to do with it? I think if you do that, you'll find that others will come along much quicker. Everybody looks for a leader, in my experience. Nobody wants to be first. Everybody's looking over their shoulders and saying - what's he doing? What are they doing? This is true in industry and I just think it may well be true also among universities.

So I would urge you to end your deliberations by planning, at least, to come up with something very concrete so you can be able to determine that you have or have not achieved something for your program the next time you meet. So many of our efforts in the human rights area deal so much with the philosophical and the theory that it's

necessary to say this to you. Because when you're dealing with contractors and with unions, you're dealing with very pragmatic people. And the one thing that they've learned to do in their association in what is known as the labor movement and collective bargaining agreement is to use time. What they do is stall. They will agree to anything next year. They will agree to talk about anything. But you have got to come up with an instrument that will let you know, as quickly as possible, where you are so that something can be achieved. If it's 10% of what you want, that's better than nothing.

APPENDIX C

Fall 1971 WORKSHOP RECOMMENDATIONS

I. GENERAL

1. Principles on which the future Consortium is based:

Employment as a social value;
The Philadelphia Plan as a legal basis for enforcement;
The future demand for construction workers (1970-1980: a growth of 3.2% annually or a total of 1 million workers as predicted by Bureau of Labor Statistics);
The builder can play a role like the consumer in setting policy through pooling strength ($595,555,972 in current and projected building for 27 colleges, $227,604,000 in current building alone);
The academic setting can be the framework for social action;
Colleges can take the initiative through academic means such as use of data and strategic planning.

2. It is in the self-interest of the institutions of the city an well as the contractors, contractors' associations and unions, to promote equal employment opportunity in unions and construction. The attitude of "let's see who we can catch so we ourselves don't get caught" cannot serve the interest of the minority worker nor the goal of equal employment opportunity and consequently is not the objective of good monitoring.

3. At the lowest level, the purpose of monitoring is self-preservation. At a higher level, the objective is to collect indicators of performance such that success or lack of it can be determined and so that (a) good ideas can be duplicated by other; (b) the lack of success can be corrected; and (c) the means of success can be better understood and modified for even more positive steps beyond the present.

4. While the Philadelphia Plan may not in fact be the best means of accomplishing the goal of more jobs for minorities, it is the currently operating, federally enforced plan for doing so and therefore the most available, effective, legal and reasonable means of achieving this goal. Almost everyone is resigned consequently, to better, more equitable enforcement of the Plan's guidelines rather than replacement of the Plan.

5. Enforcement by (on)-site headcounts can only prove one fact and that is that indeed there are few minorities working in the five critical trades. Stronger enforcement, at this stage, will only lead to the discovery that: (a) most contractors (50-70%) are attempting to comply, (b) few contractors are complying "on the job," and (c) that most contractors who are complying are doing so through affirmative action-good faith efforts taken outside the job.

6. In certain trades there are union workers sitting "on the bench" now. The most sympathetic union leader will find it impossible to accept new men under such conditions. How long will the construction slow-down last? What promise lies ahead for the next year?...the next six years?

7. We suggest encouraging all Consortium members to report these formal subcommittee recommendations, after editing by the Policy and Goals Subcommittee, to their college/university people charged with planning responsibility for referral, approval and action by the Board of Trustees at their respective institutions.

8. The creation of a consortium approach which includes uniformity in substantive efforts in increasing minority contracting opportunities is laudable as a policy goal, but the test is in the implementation.

9. There is too much confusion and lack of consistency in enforcement procedures, monitoring forms, agency responsibility and Plan interpretation. Something should be done to eliminate the confusion and get back to the issue of the minority worker seeking a job.

10. Looking to the future, we suggest that the Consortium Policy and Goal Subcommittee immediately expedite the broadening of the Consortium base to include government agencies, public school systems and other types of institutions such as hospitals, churches, etc.

11. Monitoring the observance of regulations concerning employment of minorities by suppliers of construction materials.

II. APPRENTICES

1. Programs for increased use of apprentices and trainees.

2. Require increased apprentice ratios.

3. Institutions and contractors should encourage utilization of the maximum number of apprentices on the job site at all times with appropriate minority representation. Contracts should specify the number of minority apprentices expected on the job and the number of hours to be worked. Union acceptance should be in writing.

III. CONTRACTS

1. Provide guidelines in contracts $500,000 or greater which identify the degree of effort contractors will be expected to exercise in the use of minorities to meet these policy requirements.

2. The consortium should make use of pre-award conferences.

3. We recommend that the conference call on all GSA beneficiary institutions throughout the state to insist on substantial levels of minority employment in all job classifications, such as the Philadelphia Plan, as a precondition for the acceptance of GSA projects.

4. Charge an office, and a particular person within it, with the responsibility for development of institutional affirmative action requiring Philadelphia Plan standards as a minimum in each trade category with the understanding that this plan be incorporated in all bidding requirements.

5. Develop recommended contract modifications suitable to strengthen and in that sense modify the Philadelphia Plan where necessary. Another committee with legal counsel might best pursue the following ideas:

   Require attainment of goals on a periodic basis rather than for the life of the job;
   Require submission of a list of subcontractors either with the initial bid or afterwards by the low bidders before award notices are sent out;
   Require attendance at pre-award conferences by all Subcontractors and union representatives;
   Require submission of the manpower utilization reports on a weekly basis with the names and addresses of minority workers counted;
   Require written affirmative action programs from all Subcontractors.

6. Requests for bids, contracts and other appropriate documents should provide guidelines which identify the degree of effort contractors will be expected to exercise to meet the policy requirements; including goals, timetables and training, trade by trade.

7. Institutions and contractors should encourage utilization of the maximum number of apprentices on the job site at all times with appropriate minority representation. Contracts should specify the number of minority apprentices expected on the job and the number of hours to be worked. Union acceptance should be in writing.

IV. COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES

1. The Consortium must also develop as soon as possible cooperative agreements with government, unions and contractors in line with its stated purpose, develop liaison with governmental agencies and make recommendations to local, state and national government as well as private organizations in order to implement its policies.

V. COSTS

1. While many colleges have queried as to added costs of an equal employment and contracting program, there is no available information on this point. Alternatives which have been suggested on the question of cost include application for a grant to evaluate an equal opportunity program in order to measure costs and benefits.

2. We recommend that analysis of the area of costs always include consideration of the hidden costs of a low rate of employment and limited business opportunity, realizing its effect on urban delinquency and crime, costs of welfare and low income housing, and other poverty programming.

3. We suggest that an organization such as the University Science Center be contracted to determine (a) whether cost increases result from adherence to the Philadelphia Plan and (b) if they do, that ways and means of eliminating them be studied, with the understanding that the Consortium seek funds to pay for such a study and make mandatory the reporting of its findings to all members of the Board of Trustees of Consortium participants.

VI. EXTENSION OF PHILADELPHIA PLAN

1. Develop affirmative action-good faith effort guidelines with the aid of the OFCC for use by those officers of institutions and contractors responsible for equal employment monitoring with the intent of extending and clarifying acceptable good faith efforts. Consideration should include the following:

   Jobs obtained in trade-related, industry-related production, fabrication or maintenance;
   Jobs obtained in non trade-related positions such as home-building, or the production of commercial items (i.e. home products, prefabricated units, etc.).

VII. GSA

1. We recommend that this conference call on beneficiary institutions and the GSA to develop a system for the beneficiary institutions to conduct the day-to-day monitoring and to delegate the power to insure contract compliance, as an aid to the GSA EEO office, seeking those additional funds from the federal or state governments as necessary to accomplish this objective.

2. We recommend that the conference call on all GSA beneficiary institutions throughout the state to insist on substantial levels of minority employment in all job classifications, such as the Philadelphia Plan, as a precondition for the acceptance of GSA projects.

3. We recommend that this Conference call on the GSA to go beyond the tokenism of the present EEO office and staff it appropriate to the scope to the agency's program.

4. We recommend that this Conference call on the Governor to insure broader minority representation on the GSA Board and staff.

5. We recommend that this Conference call on the Governor and GSA to develop parallel training programs with other Commonwealth agencies such as the Departments of Education, and Labor and Industry, to develop a minority worker pool in advance and keyed to developing construction projects.

6. We recommend that this Conference call on Governor Shapp

and the GSA to take affirmative action on the utilization of minority contractors and joint ventures on both a union and nonunion basis, as an additional means of expanding minority employment.

VIII. INFORMATION RESOURCES

1. Survey needed manpower over the next six years for the city as well as the institutions and from that determination set goals and timetables for all trades.

2. Develop a single manpower utilization report form suitable to everyone's needs.

3. Develop a "library-file" of contractor compliance and affirmative action for public and consortium access.

4. Develop models of clearly defined operating procedure which would act as manuals for the designated EEO agent within the institutions and contractors organizations.

5. A job data bank on new contracts for contractors

6. A skills data bank for owners.

IX. MINORITY CONTRACTORS

1. Minority contractors and sub-contractors to be encouraged.

2. On smaller contracts, special informal efforts to use minority contractors and employees.

3. Effort should be invested in developing job contracts for minority contractors in urban and suburban areas. Extension of local plans, whether voluntary or imposed:

   To cover all of a union's jurisdictional area, city and suburbs.
   To cover all new construction, rehabilitation and renovation, regardless of source of funding.

4. Qualified minority contractors are not getting the jobs. Prime responsibility falls on "owner" (person who contracts bid).

   Set aside a percentage of all work to be awarded to

minority contractors.
Qualification criteria must be "functional" (criteria must be appropriate to the job).

5. Financing of minority contractors constitute a substantive barrier to qualification and to successful completion of contracts:

   Owners can advance equity capital to assist minority contractors in getting working capital at low effective interest rate;
   A federal or state interest subsidy program for minority contractors to reduce interest rate on working capital.

6. Revision of legislation designed to guarantee equal employment, such as Philadelphia Plan, and include alternatives such as minority contractor joint ventures, sub-contracts, etc.

X. MONITORING

1. Designate special university or college construction supervisory personnel as being responsible for the university's checking of contractor compliance.

2. The Consortium should make use of effective monitoring techniques to make this goal (increased minority opportunities) feasible.

3. Designate accountability within the institution with designated responsibility for results.

4. The company-wide compliance articles added to the Philadelphia Plan in February require the contractor to meet the goals on all jobs. Yet, there is virtually no monitoring on non-federally funded projects at the institutions. This should be corrected.

5. Institutions should designate an official who will be responsible for knowing the status of construction policy compliance at all times.

6. Solicit Congressional and Executive support for the designation of OFCC as the permanent monitoring agent for the Philadelphis region including responsibility for all federal offices and sources of funds.

XI. PENALTIES

1. Supporting evidence should be required on practices and penalties should be identified.

XII. PERSONNEL AND STAFF

1. Officer: Each Consortium institution should designate administration responsible for equal employment. This person need not be specially appointed but can be any officer or faculty member or administrator who can assume this responsibility. The equal employment officer should be responsible for on-site inspection and should know the state of compliance at all times.

2. Committee: Each equal employment officer should be assisted by advisory working committee composed of other administrative officers, the building or business departments, faculty, trustees, and students.

3. Charge an office, and a particular person within it, with the responsibility for development of institutional affirmative action plan requiring Philadelphia Plan standards as a minimum in each trade category with the understanding that this plan be incorporated in all bidding requirements.

   Encourage close coordination between that office and person, and the Offices of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC).

XIII. POLICY

1. Statement of policy: Each Consortium institution should formulate a written policy which states the degree of commitment to fair employment, including the hiring and training of minority groups in construction.

2. Designate accountability within the institution with designated responsibility for results.

3. The Consortium Structure should be as much of an informal, cooperative organization as possible. While there should be provision for officers and dues, the consortium should

not become involved in a large and legalistic bureaucracy. The most important area - a set of clear-cut goals, a definite project, and a plan to carry out that project.

4. Consortium policies should be adopted by all, but each college should develop individual programming to be most effective.

5. The legal basis of the Consortium is Executive Order 11246 and the Philadelphia Plan on which it is based. Where the consortium seeks to expand the Philadelphia Plan through implementation, such as using the inclusion of private college building, the consortium should use legal counsel at all times.

6. After the Consortium is formed, it should enlarge its membership by including non-profit institutions, suppliers, the home-building industry and any groups or organizations that can contribute to the goals of the Consortium.

7. General goals:

External goals: to bring about a significant change in the construction trades in the Philadelphia area by creating job and training opportunities for minority groups, to create opportunities for minority contracting in the Philadelphia metropolitan area.
Internal goals: to demonstrate to university students, faculty and administration a model of the university as a force for planned social change, thereby contributing to rational relationships between university, student and community, to demonstrate a model of regional inter-university and institutional coordination in planning a joint program for the urban community.

8. Operational or immediate goals:

To bring about increased numbers of minority groups in all building trades and on jobs peripheral to those trades, in all types of building and renovation whether federally funded or not.

9. Adoption of the Philadelphia Plan or an improvement of it on all construction projects (over one half million dollars in value) regardless of the source of funds.

10. Each program should seek to have as wide a group of cooperating colleges as possible. The program should follow the areas of the Task Force Committees: Minority Contractors, Use of College Curriculum, Hiring and

Training Programs, Monitoring, and Extension to Private and General State Authority Building. Within these programs, implementative programs will be planned such as referral lists for minority contractors and minority workers, adoption of a maintenance skills apprenticeship program, and use of a model contract for colleges.

11. The only positive action a contractor can take is good faith effort. But he often does not fully understand what constitutes such effor or if his attempts will be accepted by GSA, OFCC, the institution, the union, etc.

    Develop affirmative action-good faith effort guidelines with the aid of the OFCC for use by those officers of institutions and contractors responsible for equal employment monitoring with the intent of extending and clarifying acceptable good faith efforts.

12. It is the objective (and strength) of a consortium approach to EEO monitoring to provide each of the participating agents with an opportunity to gain from sharing. The Consortium, theoretically, is able to do more as a group than any individual can do alone. To attain this objective, especially in monitoring, policies which are recommended should be general enough for all to accept and yet not so general as to be inadequate to the task addressed.

13. Designate special university or college construction supervisory personnel as being responsible for the university's checking of contractor compliance.

14. We suggest that all Presidents of the Consortium's member institutions, with the endorsement of their respective Boards of Trustees, join in a request - which they, themselves, would first elicit - from the Governor and the Mayor, calling upon local unions to guarantee, during the next ten years, certain projected increases in minority membership in all the critical trades.

15. If they currently do not have one, institutions should formulate a written policy which states the degree of commitment to fair employment, including the hiring and training of minority groups in construction with stated periodic reviews for the purpose of upgrading.

XIV. TRAINING

1. Use and training of minorities in skilled maintenance jobs.

2. Use of college curriculum and facilities to enhance programming; the institutions should develop a program of education so that their own personnel will accept the training and use of minorities.

3. Often we forget that a man may want to enter a trade other than the so-called "critical" ones. Yet, all the current training programs, good faith efforts, etc. are pushing these men into areas they may not be interested in. There should be more encouragement given to enter men into the trade they want rather than the trade the federal government has designated as "short" of minorities.

4. It is imperative that the resistance from the unions be alleviated in order that the following recommended policies be implemented:

   A "Skill Schema Curriculum Center" should be organized. It should be a consortium of institutions in this area and based at a prestige university or college.

   The Skill Schema Center should be developed in which individuals of varying educational background from the minority community can be matriculated at various levels into a trade-oriented training program emphasizing preparation for immediate employment, entry into union apprenticeship and ultimately union participation.

   Requirements for entry into this Career Skill Center should be very flexible and not follow the established educational direction being used today. This is important because there is a lack of educational background in the needed community.

APPENDIX III

WORKING STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT TO THE CONSORTIUM

Preamble

Whereas the non-white (black, brown, red and yellow) minorities constitute almost twenty percent of the Philadelphia area population but are less than two percent of recognized skilled workers in the six least integrated crafts and less than ten percent of the workers in other skilled crafts of the building and construction industry;

Whereas Federal executive order 11246 has established the legal precedent to obtain integration of minority workers in these trades on federally assisted projects;

Whereas buyers of construction services can insist on contract provisions to obtain an integrated work force at each skill level in construction;

Whereas area colleges and universities account for a significant portion of both planned and projected construction in this region;

And whereas colleges and universities as educators of future leaders in society have a moral responsibility to lead by example in achieving the goal of equal employment opportunity;

Be it hereby resolved that the undersigned colleges and universities do pledge to seek to achieve these goals:

1) To equalize employment outcome as well as opportunity in the building and construction trades in the Philadelphia area.

2) To increase the cooperation among area institutions of higher learning in attacking problems of mutual concern.

3) To demonstrate that through such cooperative relationships equality of opportunity may be achieved for all citizens.

To achieve these goals we deem it necessary to:

1) Formulate and implement an affirmative action policy regarding the employment of minority group persons at our respective schools.

2) Join collectively to insist that no projects be built on any of our campuses unless the contractors doing the work employ some predetermined number of minority workers on each project.

3) Unite to share resources which can help to insure a supply of minority workers adequate to meet the above stated goals.

Undersigned colleges and universities

_____

_____

_____

MEANS TO ACHIEVE THE STATED COMMITMENT

In order to achieve the above stated goals, there are many possible means. Each institution should choose those means which best meet its particular situation. The crucial element is the collective agreement not to hire contractors who do not themselves employ some minimum number of minority workers on campus construction projects. If any institution desires to use minority contractors to do part or all of the work, that is all to the good. Specifics of contracts, means and methods of monitoring, personnel to be responsible for monitoring, and similar subjects will be decided entirely on an individual basis.

The Consortium will, however, offer suggestions, ranging from general to specific, on each of the above topics to aid and guide member institutions. Where members see that it is worthwhile for collective action, they can urge that such action be taken. The individual members will then decide.

Listed below in four general categories are recommendations made by representatives to the Consortium meeting in November of 1971. These recommendations, plus a few additions, suggest some of the means of accomplishing the goals stated above. None are specific. They are meant to be suggestive to the reader of the types of things which must be taken into consideration when one is attempting to change the racial pattern in the building trades via restrictions on contractors. At some future date these means will be expanded upon so that what each involves is further explained. For the moment the suggestions should serve as stimulants to discussion and to further questions.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The four part breakdown below is used to help separate the various stages of involvement. The first, on an equal employment office, involves the establishment of an office within each respective institution charged with the specific concern of equal employment opportunity. The second part, contracts, involves the procedure of getting contractors' consent to a given minority employment plan. The third, on monitoring, concerns the ways and means of making sure a contractor meets his commitment. The fourth, on supply of workers, suggests ways, most of which are collective, of insuring that enough minority workers are available that contract commitments can be met.

Equal Employment Opportunity Office

1) Charge an office, and a particular person within it, with the responsibility for development of two institutional affirmative action plans. One plan should apply to all internal employment and the other to employment on all construction projects in which the institution is engaged. In connection with the latter, it is suggested, but not required, that Philadelphia Plan standards be used as a minimum in each trade category with the understanding that this plan be incorporated in all bidding requirements. Experience indicates that while commitment in the form of a plan does not guarantee success, the lack of commitment makes progress extremely unlikely, so it behooves an institution to make a formal commitment.

2) Make the equal employment officer responsible for on-site inspection and for knowledge of the state of compliance at all times.

3) Encourage close coordination between that office and person, and the Offices of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC).

4) Develop affirmative action, good faith effort guidelines with the aid of the OFCC for use by those officers of institutions and contractors responsible for equal employment monitoring with the intent of extending and clarifying acceptable good faith efforts.

5) Each consortium institution should formulate a written policy which states the degree of commitment to fair employment, including the hiring and training of minority groups in construction with stated periodic reviews for the purpose of upgrading. This policy should apply to the university maintenance force as well as to outside contracts.

Contracts

A. All Members

1. Requests for bids, contracts and other appropriate documents should provide guidelines which identify the degree of effort contractors will be expected to exercise to meet the policy requirements: e.g., goals, timetables and training, trade by trade.

2. Institutions and contractors should encourage utilization of the maximum number of apprentices on the job site at all times with appropriate minority representation. Contracts should specify the number of minority apprentices expected on the job and the number of hours to be worked. Union acceptance should be in writing.

3. Institutions should develop contract modifications suitable to strengthen and in that sense modify the Philadelphia Plan where necessary. The following are recommended:

a. Require attainment of goals on a periodic basis rather than for the life of the job;

b. Require submission of a list of subcontractors either with the initial bid or afterwards by the low bidders before award notices are sent out;

c. Require attendance at pre-award conferences by all contractors, subcontractors, and union representatives;

d. Require submission of the manpower utilization reports on a weekly basis with the names and addresses of minority workers counted;

e. Require written affirmative action programs from all subcontractors.

4. Institutions should use legal counsel on all aspects of contract writing and bidding.

B. General State Authority Affiliates

Since substantial university and college building in Pennsylvania falls within the jurisdiction of the General State Authority (GSA) the following recommendations are suggested:

1. That the Consortium call on all GSA beneficiary institutions throughout the state to insist on substantial levels of minority employment in all job classifications, such as the Philadelphia Plan, as a precondition for the acceptance of GSA projects.

2. That the Consortium call on the GSA and the Governor to go beyond the tokenism of the present EEO office, and staff it appropriate to the scope of the agency's program; and in addition, broaden minority representation on the GSA board and staff.

3. That GSA develop parallel training programs with other Commonwealth agencies such as the Departments of Education, and Labor and Industry, to develop a minority worker pool in advance, and keyed to developing construction projects.

4. That GSA take affirmative action on the utilization of minority contractors and joint ventures on both a union and non-union basis, as an additional means of expanding minority employment.

Monitoring

The objective of monitoring is to collect indicators of performance such that success or lack of it can be determined and so that (a) good ideas can be duplicated by others, (b) the lack of success can be corrected, and (c) the means of success can be better understood and modified for even more positive steps beyond the present.

Toward this objective the following are recommended:

1. Be sure, as is suggested above, that each institution has a person designated to regularly check on compliance.

2. Member institutions should work to establish a common agreement on, at least, a monitoring form, an enforcement procedure, agency responsibility, and interpretation of quotas for minority workers.

3. The member institutions should solicit Congressional and Executive support for the designation of OFCC as the permanent monitoring agent for the Philadelphia region including responsibility for all federal offices and sources of funds.

4. The member institutions should push the federal government and state government to require monitoring of projects not funded by them but covered by existing regulations.

Supply of Workers

To try to insure that there will be enough black workers available to meet contract requirements, the Consortium members can take some specific steps. They can use minority contractors or subcontractors; they can help establish or support job training efforts; and they can help establish a research and information center for minority construction. The recommendations listed below are among those made at the November conference.

A. Minority Contractors

1. Individual institutions can hire a minority contractor for a job, or as is more likely due to the smaller size of most minority contractors, they can require contractors to sub-contract minority contractors. Or the institutions can "set aside" a percentage of all work for minority contractors, thereby directly engaging minority contractors.

2. Financing of minority contractors constitutes a substantive barrier to qualification for, and to successful completion of, contracts. Owners can:

a. Advance equity capital to assist minority contractors in getting working capital at low effective interest rate;

b. Unite to push for a federal or state interest subsidy program for minority contractors to reduce interest on working capital.

3. Current plans such as the Philadelphia Plan do not take minority contractors into consideration. Therefore, to develop more job contracts for minority contractors, local plans, whether voluntary or imposed, should be extended:

a. To cover all of a union's jurisdictional area, city and suburbs.

b. To cover all new construction, rehabilitation and renovation, regardless of source of funding.

4. On smaller contracts, special informal efforts should be made to use minority contractors.

B. Training

1. A "Skill Schema Curriculum Center" to prepare minority workers for skilled construction crafts should be organized by a group of the Consortium member institutions and be based at one of their campuses.

a. The Center should be developed to accommodate individuals of varying educational backgrounds from the minority community, allowing for matriculation

at various levels into a trade-oriented training program emphasizing preparation for immediate employment, entry into union apprenticeship, and ultimately union participation.

b. Entrance requirements should be very flexible and not follow the established educational direction being used today. This is important because there is a lack of educational background in the minority community and if applied to the present matriculating system, would cause the community to be overlooked.

2. If the Center cannot be established or until it is established the following measures are recommended:

a. Establish a pre-examination procedure for needy individuals to prepare them for exams for entrance to training programs, apprenticeship programs, and union participation.

b. Encourage the joint development and coordination of apprentice, Outreach and Journeymen Training programs by: Urban Coalition, General Building Contractor's Association, Spring Garden College, Labor Unions, and the Building Trades Council. We suggest that this effort be supported by united Consortium action to obtain program training funds.

c. Encourage representatives of Temple University's College of Engineering Technology, Spring Garden College, and unions to study jointly with the Philadelphia Public School System and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Education how to improve vocational education curriculum and to develop an agreement leading to union acceptance of high school graduates at certain pre-determined skill levels.

C. Research and Information Center

To aid Consortium members in understanding current employment conditions for minority workers, to aid in monitoring activities, and to aid in location of minority contractors, it is recommended that a research and information center be established by the Consortium. It would be responsible for the following:

1. Survey needed manpower over the next six years for the city as well as the institutions and from that determination, set goals and timetables for all trades;

2. Develop a single manpower utilization report form suitable to everyone's needs;

3. Develop a "library file" of contractor compliance and affirmative action for public and Consortium access;

4. Develop models of clearly defined operating procedure which would act as manuals for the designated EEO agent within the institutions and contractors

organizations;

5. Provide a job data bank on new contracts for contractors;

6. Develop a skills data bank for owners, including a list of minority contractors with information about each, such as quality, capability, size, area of specialty, geographic areas of work, etc.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Affirmative Action: A program of specific goals and timetables for the employment of minority group workers (minority manpower utilization) prepared and submitted by a contractor to meet definite standards for equal employment opportunity included in invitation or other solicitation for bids.

Apprentice: A classification of union membership signifying a Trainee. Apprentices are admitted by examination and must serve in this classfication for a specified number of years (varying by trade) before they are considered qualified for journeyman (fully trained craftsman) status.

Apprentice Ratio: The ratio of apprentices to journeymen which is allowed on construction jobs. This ratio is established by collective bargaining agreements between unions and contractors.

Construction Contract: Defined under Federal Executive Order 11246 as any contract for the construction, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, extension or repair of buildings, highways or other improvements to real property.

EEOC: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission; the Federal Commission established by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to administer that section of the act dealing with equal employment opportunity.

Equity Capital: The amount which an individual has invested in a business or property as opposed to the amount loaned by a financial institution - also called risk capital or venture capital.

Executive Directive #13: The expression of the Pennsylvania State government's commitment to equal rights within its own corporate structure.

Executive Directive #21: The implementation of Executive Directive #13, calling for goals and timetables in departmental work forces, action plans, review of services, policies and contract compliance, appointment of affirmative action officers and advisory committees.

Executive Order 11246: The Presidential order, which expresses in specifics the U.S. Government's policy of non-discrimination in employment. It gives the Secretary of Labor responsibility for administering the order in the area of employment by Government contractors and subcontractors. Contractors shall take affirmative action to insure that employees shall be treated equally, without regard to race, color, creed or national origin, such actions to include but not be limited to: employment, upgrading,

demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. It establishes requirements for reporting and sets up sanctions and penalties.

Executive Order 11375: The Presidential order which extends the provisions of Executive Order 11246 to include "sex," making the prohibition - "discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin."

Good Faith: Efforts made by a contractor to meet the specific goals and timetables of his affirmative action plan which are acceptable even though he fails to meet his goal. The Philadelphia Plan sets up minimum requirements for good faith as: evidence that the contractor has contacted community organizations for recruiting; evidence that he has maintained a referral file of minority workers; notification to OFCC that the union referral process has impeded him; demonstration that he has availed himself of local training programs.

Joint Venture: A contract undertaken jointly by two or more contractors. It often refers to a joining of minority and white contractors or a group of minority contractors to undertake a project which would be beyond the resources of one minority contractor alone.

Manpower Utilization Report: A reporting form which shows the number of manhours worked by minority group members as compared to total hours on a job; used for monitoring compliance.

Monitoring: A system of checking and supervision to make certain that equal employment opportunity requirements are being met by the contractor.

OFCC: The Office of Federal Contract Compliance, a division of the U.S. Department of Labor responsible for enforcing the provisions of Executive Order 11246 with regard to government contractors and subcontractors.

The Philadelphia Plan: The plan designed to implement Executive Order 11246 in the five-county Philadelphia area (Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, Philadelphia). It applies to all Federal and Federally-assisted construction contracts, the estimated total cost of which exceeds $ 500,000. The Plan is concerned with six crafts in which minority participation is extremely low: iron workers, plumbers and pipefitters, steamfitters, sheet metal workers, electrical workers, and elevator construction workers.

The heart of the plan is the policy statement by OFCC that no contracts or subcontracts will be awarded for Federal or Federally-assisted construction in the

Philadelphia area whose costs exceed $ 500,000 unless the bidder submits an acceptable affirmative action program which includes specific goals for the inclusion of minority workers in the above mentioned six trades. OFCC will help to establish an acceptable goal range for the incusion of minority workers in each trade, and it is expected that each contractor will plan to hire enough minority workers to bring his work force within that goal range. If a contractor's affirmative action plan does not indicate that sufficient minority workers will be hired to meet the goal range, his bid will be disqualified.

The plan has recently been modified to incude non-federally funded construction activities of contractors or sub-contractors working on federal or federally-assisted construction projects, the estimated total cost of which exceeds $ 500,000. What this means is that if a contractor is bound by the Philadelphia Plan because of his involvement on federally funded construction, then his entire work force in the five county area regardless of the project is subject to the same stipulations of minority inclusion as found in the Plan.

The plan has been challenged in the courts, and its legality has been upheld.

Pre-Award Conference: A meeting of the owner with all prospective contractors and subcontractors to explain to them the details of the bidding procedure. In this context the subject of prime importance is the specifics of the affirmative action plan which each contractor must submit with his bid.

Set Aside: A block of jobs, be it a few or an entire contract, which is to be awarded without competitive bidding. It usually goes to a minority contractor.

Subcontractor: Someone to whom a part of a job is contracted out by a general contractor; the subcontractor is usually responsible to the general contractor rather than to the owner; a subcontractor is most often a specialist, e.g. electrician, plumber.

Working Capital: That amount of money, be it cash-on-hand or in liquid assets, which a businessman has available to meet on-going operating expenses.